



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009

No. 42

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCINTYRE).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 10, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MIKE MCINTYRE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

### HOUSE REPUBLICANS ARE ON THE SIDE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting. Congress was right to take action to get this economy moving, but higher taxes and massive Federal spending is not the cure for what ails this economy. The American people know that, too. They know we cannot tax and spend and bail our way back to a growing economy.

Raising taxes during a recession on almost every American is a prescrip-

tion for economic decline. The stock market and other indicators are showing that.

More than half of the Americans paying higher taxes under the Democrat plan are small business owners filing as individuals. Raising taxes on small businesses where a majority of Americans go to work every day will not put American families back to work. Raising utility rates on every household in America will place an undue burden on families struggling to make ends meet. Cutting deductions for charitable giving will harm higher education, scientific research, and religious organizations struggling to do good in our society.

Democrats are on the side of more government and more taxes. House Republicans are on the side of the American people. And let me talk just a minute about that so-called stimulus bill which passed here a couple of weeks ago.

We were told that the stimulus bill had to be passed, had to be passed immediately because it was going to create 3 to 4 million new jobs in this country. Now, some of us were skeptical about that from the very beginning, but we want to make sure that what is promised is kept.

Now, I come from the State of North Carolina, Mr. Speaker, as you do. The State's motto in North Carolina is "To Be Rather Than to Seem." I think it is a good motto for all of us to live by. And let me give an example of how the stimulus package is a package "to seem" rather than "to be."

Here's a Democrat stimulus myth in the State of Montana. A press release from Senators BAUCUS and TESTER claimed that \$1.3 million in stimulus money would create 40 new jobs for the Flathead City County Health Department; sounds great, sounds like a good excuse for voting for a waste of money. But here's the reality; the money will simply provide another year of funding

for the Department's community health center, which already has 10 full-time positions. The community health center plans to add only two more jobs—two, not 40. We need to be dealing with what is rather than what the Democrat majority and the President want the American people to believe.

Let me say again, the budget, the stimulus, spend too much money. They tax too much—the largest tax increase in history. They borrow too much money—the highest level of borrowing ever. This is not the way to get our economy back on track. The Democrats are going in the wrong direction.

House Republicans understand that the American people are hurting. We had an alternative plan that created twice as many jobs for half the cost, but it was summarily dismissed.

Republicans aren't saying "no" to everything, we're presenting better alternatives, but the Democrat majority and the President want you to believe that all we're saying is no. That's not right. We're "being" rather than "seeming."

### BETTER CHOICES FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to listen to my good friend from North Carolina with her interpretation.

You know, it's interesting. My Republican friends simply had no solution other than to gut the infrastructure investments that are so critical, the important health care initiatives, and replace them with more tax cuts, most of which would not meet the needs of people who need help the most.

I will tell you, I invite people to look at what we did. Indeed, the \$6 billion that is flowing to my State of Oregon

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3107

over the next 2 years has made a critical difference to support State services, to be able to invest in cleaning up the environment, to save and create jobs. I've posted a guide on my Web site to each and every one of those provisions—62 pages in all—where people can track for themselves. There are not, for example, tax increases for most Americans. My friend from North Carolina is just flat wrong. If she would research the bill that we approved here on the floor, she would find that in fact 95 percent of the people get tax cuts. Nobody is having tax increases over the next couple of years, even the very wealthy. And it's what, in fact, America has asked for.

I would suggest that it's time for us to step back from some of this goofy back and forth because I think there are a wide range of areas that we can agree that reform needs to be made.

I like what I heard from President Obama on the campaign trail and what I heard from the rostrum here when the President addressed his first joint session of Congress. There are a number of areas of health, energy, tax, and agriculture that actually can bring people together. Now is not the time for commissions and study groups or for mindless political bickering; now is the time to actually do what we know we can accomplish.

There are multiple areas where it isn't so much picking low-hanging fruit, it's actually picking that fruit up off the ground. We need to articulate a vision of how we're going to accomplish that. For example, in the area of agriculture, it's not just the problem in the past that rich sugar farmers have had more clout than poor hungry children. There are ways in reforming agriculture that we can put more money in the pocket of more ranchers and farmers and less into the pockets of the wealthy few who don't need it.

We can implement reforms to help change the bureaucracy with things like crop insurance reform, that independent observers have identified for years, but Congress hasn't had the will to follow through on fixing it. We can pay farmers and ranchers to protect the environment, not to damage it. We can concentrate on strengthening American agriculture and producing more healthy food rather than a few commodities, frankly, that the world has enough of.

In the area of health, the research is in. There are a number of communities across the country that are low cost, high performing where people live longer and get sick less often. In fact, we see some of the areas of the country where we are spending the most government money in Medicare actually is not helping people. Rather, many of those areas actually have worse results because people get unnecessary tests and procedures, not concentrating on things that will make them healthy. We can reward the low-cost, high-performing areas while we send signals to those that are spending lots of money

and not performing very well. Let's send the message there's a bipartisan consensus that we're going to fix that.

In the area of transportation, there is a vast coalition that has emerged around the country that wants to help the Federal Government get more money and streamline the Federal partnership. They are willing to work with us so that there are more choices, higher standards, and sustainable revenue. The Chamber of Commerce, organized labor, environmentalists, transit advocate bicyclists, all combine in an approach to make America's transportation partnership with State and local governments better and stronger.

We don't need to rely on the same old patterns. We can, in this Congress, take action that unite people all across the spectrum all across the country. We've got a President who can use the bully pulpit. I strongly urge that we work with him for a new vision, more value, better choices for Americans, and to do it now.

#### 2009 OMNIBUS SPENDING BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus spending bill is not an example of change here in Congress and continues the Democrat's spending spree in the first 2 months of the 111th Congress. Even a record \$1.4 trillion budget deficit has not stopped Congress' culture of spending on special projects. While families and business owners are cutting back and bringing their budgets under control, Congress, under Democrat leadership, is spending and earmarking as if nothing has changed.

Here are a few highlights of the bill that is being debated in the Senate right now. There is an 8 percent discretionary spending hike. After passing an unprecedented massive spending bill that is the largest this country has ever seen, the Democrat leadership ushered through this House an omnibus bill that will give a staggering 80 percent increase to discretionary programs when coupled with a \$1 trillion stimulus package. This bill will contribute to a permanent \$2,000 per household tax hike for every household. It contains 9,300 special funding requests, projects that cost nearly \$13 billion. Now, the argument is made that Members have a right to make these special district funding requests, but I, for one, would gladly place a moratorium on all district funding requests until the economy is corrected.

Let me say again, this omnibus spending bill increases discretionary spending by 8 percent when less than 3 weeks ago Congress and the President, under Democratic leadership, ran through a massive stimulus package where the same discretionary programs received much of the unprecedented \$1.1 trillion in government spending.

Now, counting those funds, this omnibus spending bill will institute an 80

percent spending increase for those programs in 2009 from \$378 billion to \$680 billion. This spending increase by the Democratic Party is unprecedented in American history.

The domestic spending programs which the omnibus focuses on have not been cut in the past decade; in fact, they have only increased from 2001 through 2008. These programs grew 23 percent faster than inflation, including increases for education at 35 percent, health research at 37 percent, and veterans benefits at 54 percent. It is apparent that during these fiscally challenging times these programs could have survived without some of these large increases.

Regrettably, the omnibus bill does not offset this new spending. It does not attempt to cut spending or institute reductions in inefficient or duplicate or worthless government programs. And let me just give you further example, Mr. Speaker, where some savings could be made; \$55 billion in annual program overpayments, \$60 billion for corporate welfare, \$123 billion for programs for which government auditors can find no evidence of success; \$140 billion in potential budget savings identified in the CBO Budget Options document.

Program duplication: There are 342 economic development programs; 134 programs serving the disabled, they're all duplicate; 130 programs serving at-risk youth, these are duplicate; and there's 90 duplicate early childhood development programs.

□ 1045

While some of these programs may be important, I find it hard to believe that each of the 342 economic development programs paid for by the American taxpayer, each and every one is vital to the American people. This has been identified, all these programs that duplicate.

Unfortunately, taxpayers should not expect change in the future. The administration and the Democrat party have already signed into law a large expansion of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, putting middle class children who already have private health insurance on taxpayer-funded, government-run health care programs; weakened the 1996 welfare reforms in the \$1.1 trillion stimulus package; and instituted permanent government growth in the areas of education, infrastructure and Medicaid.

Last year, President Bush signed an executive order stating that Federal agencies must ignore earmarks that appear in nonbinding conference reports and instead implement only those in the bill text itself. That executive order currently remains in effect. President Obama, who campaigned on ending politics as usual in Washington, could strike a blow to the earmark culture in Congress by simply leaving this executive order in place. Doing so would eliminate all earmarks that Congress has not incorporated by reference

into the omnibus bill text. He should go one step further and veto any omnibus bill that explicitly has earmarks.

In the past six months, Congress has enacted a \$700 billion financial bailout and a \$1.1 trillion stimulus. I say it is time to end the culture of pork, and stop spending money that our children will have to pay back in the future.

#### SOLVING AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 15 years we have a real chance to solve America's health care crisis. The stars are aligning as has never been seen before. The American people want a solution, American business needs a solution to stay competitive and retain their best employees, segments of the health care industry, such as doctors, want a solution, and the President and the Congress have started a dialogue. Yet despite all those positive signs, we must not make the mistake of believing a solution is at hand or that it will come easily.

As a nation we stand at a crossroads, either sweeping reform or sweeping this crisis under the rug with another Band-Aid. We have to translate the national dialogue into legislation that makes access to affordable health care coverage what it must be in a free and Democratic society, a right and not a privilege.

There are lot of pieces to that puzzle and some are more readily solved more than others. In fact, I think some early victories might help instill confidence in the American people. Let me give you an example.

When I graduated from medical school, I was \$500 in debt after my entire medical education. Today, the average medical student is well over \$100,000 in debt. When you are underwater by that much money, you are forced to make decisions based on debt service, not on public service. Across America, from inner-cities to rural communities, we are woefully short of primary doctors. And as long as new doctors have to chase high paying jobs to pay off their debt, we are going to remain short staffed in these underserved areas in our country.

Today I am introducing legislation that would offer scholarships that would pay for most all of tuition for medical students in public colleges if they will apply their medical training in underserved areas when they graduate; an even exchange, one year of tuition for one year of service.

The American Medical Association says there were 45,000 students enrolled last year in public medical colleges and the mean cost of tuition was \$20,000. For a total investment of less than \$1 billion per year, my legislation would provide a workforce so that every American can have access to affordable

health care wherever they live. The scholarships would be accessible to a medical student enrolled full time and in good academic standing at a public institution.

Imagine the positive impact that we would have if we empowered new doctors to serve their country and the highest ideals of their profession instead of serving their debt load. It is important to make the financial commitment at the beginning of medical school so that students can study areas that are related to primary care.

Anyone who knows me knows I have long advocated a universal health care system, providing a minimum set of benefits for everyone. But we cannot get universal coverage or any interim step on the way to universal coverage without addressing, and reducing, the cost of health care education for our doctors.

We could make a significant impact by lowering the cost of the health care workforce if my bill were accepted. But we would do something else. There are a lot of talented young people who don't have the financial means to go to medical school and fear a crushing debt burden even if they qualify. By removing that mountain of debt, we could use that rock to build a foundation for a permanent solution.

We can solve America's health care problem and we can do it before the end of this year, but this is a first step that must happen. We must think about the workforce that will provide that universal access to everyone in the country. We cannot continue with the present funding of health care education and expect that we are going to have the people to provide the primary care, to do the wellness care, to do the prevention. They will all go into high-paid specialties to pay off their debt.

This bill is a step that we must take, and it is one where we can make a step forward for all the people in this country.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER) at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Today we bless You and praise You Lord for friends. Friendship is a gift, Lord, freely given by one person to another. Not merited, not purchased,

never manipulated, never demanded, friendship is uncovered in mutual self-revelation and common exchange. Desirous of the comfort found in another's companionship and tested by time, friendship spontaneously grows from within.

Friends truly know who we are. Friends stand with each other in good times and in bad times. True friends tell the truth without ever hurting. We steer friends away from what is wrong and seek only what is good for their friends.

Lord, strengthen Members of Congress with friends who will prove faithful no matter what transpires. Give them friends who will support them when they are right in spite of pressure from others and who will correct them when they are wrong no matter who agrees with them.

A friend may not change your taste, your reading, or your opinion, but a true friend will change what you long for and what you love. As different as they are from each other, true friends will accept each other as they are and share their differences—until they simply enjoy being together.

Lord, for lasting friends of the past, those we hold in friendship now and those we are yet to meet, we thank You, both now and forever. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution calling on the President and the allies of the United States to raise the case of Robert Levinson with officials of the Government of Iran at every level and opportunity, and urging officials of the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance to the family of Robert Levinson and to share information on the investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Sailors of the United States Submarine Force upon the completion of

1,000 Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) deterrent patrols.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by S. Res. 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105-275 (adopted October 21, 1998), further amended by S. Res. 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), amended by S. Res. 383 (adopted October 27, 2000), and amended by S. Res. 355 (adopted November 13, 2002), and further amended by S. Res. 480 (adopted November 21, 2004), the Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, the appointment of the following Senators as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the One Hundred Eleventh Congress:

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as Democratic Co-Chairman.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) as Democratic Co-Chairman.

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) as Democratic Co-Chairman.

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN).

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) as Majority Administrative Co-Chairman.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### DEEP VEIN THROMBOSIS

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the need for raising awareness about deep vein thrombosis, commonly known as DVT. Two million Americans are affected by DVT every year. That is more than breast cancer and AIDS combined.

However, many Americans are not aware of what DVT is, or how to recognize its signs and symptoms. We may see people wearing pressure stockings following surgery or on long plane flights.

The tragic loss of our former colleague, Congresswoman Jennifer Dunn, to DVT demonstrates how close to home this disease can be for all of us. Not only is DVT killing too many Americans every year, it is also taking a toll on our Nation's hospital systems, costing approximately \$860 million annually.

That is why I am so proud to join with my colleague, Representative CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, in introducing a resolution recognizing Deep Vein Thrombosis Awareness Month and National DVT Screening Day. I hope

we can count on all of our colleagues to join us in supporting this resolution and in raising awareness about this disease.

#### OBAMA BUDGET

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I returned to Washington yesterday from my weekly visit home, and had the privilege of spending time with many of my constituents. They asked that I carry back a message to Washington, a simple message: stop the spending binge.

Right now families across the country are hurting. Many have lost their jobs, and many more worry they will be next. Families are tightening their budgets and small businesses are cutting expenses. The American people are making the sacrifices necessary to weather this storm. And yet they hear on their local news that it is business as usual in Washington. It is more spending and more taxes from the Democrat Congress and from President Obama, who promised a new direction.

The people in my district know we cannot borrow and spend our way back to a healthy economy. Let's follow the example set by the American people. Let's make the tough choices that are necessary to get our economy back on track. Let's start putting fiscal restraint and the American people first.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. WALZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today and know that this Congress has started tackling the issue of health care reform in a real, meaningful way. Already this Congress has passed legislation that will provide health insurance to millions of uninsured children, bring health care into the 21st century with new health information technology, and start us on the path of providing high-quality care at a lower cost.

My home State of Minnesota has been a leader in this. In my district, the Mayo Clinic, in particular, is a renowned medical institution that has always been at the forefront of efforts to reform and improve health care. They helped pioneer the use of electronic medical records. Electronic medical records reduce the time patients spend in waiting rooms filling out forms, and they also let doctors access a patient's history immediately, reducing errors. They cut down on administrative costs, saving our entire system billions of dollars. In addition to leading the way on medical technology, Mayo has been a leader in providing high-quality care.

As we move forward on health care reform, we need to acknowledge our current rewards quantity over quality. We can look to Mayo, which has been

lauded for its ability to produce the highest quality outcomes at the lowest possible cost.

I am proud to represent my district, and I think we can lead the way to meaningful reform.

#### DEEP VEIN THROMBOSIS

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and recognition of a good friend, a mentor, and someone who proudly represented the great State of Washington, former Representative Jennifer Dunn. She tragically died of a pulmonary embolism in 2007.

Today, my colleague and I, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPS, are introducing a resolution marking the second Tuesday in March as the National DVT Screening Day. It is appropriate that we do so because deep vein thrombosis is killing about 300,000 people in the U.S. today. It is common, but preventable. It is time to make screening a health priority, and urge health care providers and patients to be aware of this silent killer.

Jennifer had an unwavering commitment to women and families in America and around the world. Let us remember her and others as we recognize the risks and treatment for DVT.

#### COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, last month the Department of Homeland Security reported that over 100,000 parents of U.S. born children were deported between 1998 and 2007. And the Homeland Security inspector stated that these figures are incomplete because the agency does not keep track of how many children each parent has.

This past Saturday, I hosted an event in my district for families to come and share their stories about how they have been impacted by the broken immigration system. The audience on several occasions had to hold back their tears as they heard the stories of how families, like the Serrano family from Bloomington, California, have been separated from their parents.

Children like those in the Serrano family are the real victims of this outdated immigration system that separates families.

As Speaker PELOSI said this morning at a meeting with Latino leaders, "We must immediately end raids that separate families."

I urge my colleagues in the House and the Senate and President Obama to work with CHC toward comprehensive immigration reform.

## OIL AND GAS LEASE SALES

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, the Interior Department is going forward with the oil and gas production lease sale in the central Gulf of Mexico. I welcome the Interior Secretary to my home State of Louisiana this March.

While visiting our great State, I would like to remind Secretary Salazar that although it is a positive gesture to move forward with this lease sale, the benefit of these leases will greatly be diminished under tax hikes—that is removal of exploratory incentives that are included in this administration's budget proposal.

This \$30 billion tax increase could devastate an industry that directly and indirectly employs over 300,000 Louisianans. This tax increase will wreak havoc on small independent producers and third-party services. It will also continue to perpetuate the cycle of high fuel prices and our addiction to foreign sources of energy who want to see our democracy fail.

In short, this proposed budget does nothing to solve our energy needs. If anything, it will lead to more cost and massive job loss for many Americans, especially in Louisiana, who are suffering in this economic recession.

## ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, we have had a change in America. We have gone from a previous President who for 8 years didn't believe in regulation and believed in tax cuts, which led us to the greatest economic crisis which we have faced in this country in 76 years, to a President who believes in regulation and believes in stimulating the economy.

There are two ways you can help get the economy moving. One is monetary policy and the other is fiscal. Right now the only way we can do it is fiscal because monetary has gone down to about zero. We have done all we can do with monetary. So the stimulus package, the Recovery Reinvestment Act, is what America needs. Some would suggest we haven't done enough. Mr. Krugman suggests that. I tend to agree with him. But the fact is we can only get three Republican votes in the Senate, one vote more than we needed for the bill in the Senate, so you get what you can get from the Senate.

I support my President because he has a policy and a program that will get us out of this recession and move America forward to being the great national and international leader that we need to be in the 21st century, and we can only do that by supporting our President with a stimulus package.

## CARD CHECK

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, there is an effort underway in Washington to take away the right of the secret ballot vote from American workers.

Colleagues on the other side of the aisle will introduce today a bill misnamed Employee Free Choice Act, also called the Card Check bill.

This is a bill that would allow for the establishment of a union not by secret ballot vote, but simply if the majority of employees at a company sign a card lending their support. This process, called "card check," opens employees up to coercion and intimidation.

The secret ballot is a fundamental principle of American democracy. If individuals want to join a union, they are entitled to that right. They can show their support with their vote. But if workers do not want to pay union dollars to be used to advance a political agenda they disagree with, they should also be afforded the same right, to cast their vote free of coercion and intimidation in a secret ballot election.

Card check is an assault on the principles of our Nation and would be a job killer during a time when we cannot afford to lose more jobs.

□ 1215

## LIFTING THE BAN ON STEM CELL RESEARCH

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud President Obama's executive order lifting the ban on Federal funding of embryonic stem cell research.

I join scientists across the country, especially researchers at the University of Louisville, who are excited about the opportunities that expanded research presents.

But as we all know, there is another dimension to this issue, and it involves moral questions about the use of discarded embryos for scientific purposes. I fully respect the views of those who raise moral objections to embryonic stem cell research; their convictions are just as valid and unassailable as the scientific arguments made about the potential of stem cell research. On the other side, however, are equally valid and, to my mind, unassailable moral arguments that support President Obama's decision this week. They are analogous to the arguments made in support of organ donation and transplantation. Here, human material that has the potential to save life is not being squandered.

Like those who raise moral objections to stem cell research, I would have problems with the production of embryos for scientific purposes, but to me, the destruction of embryos that can be used to advance science in the

service of life raises similar moral problems.

I congratulate President Obama on his action.

## VETERANS PASS ACT

(Mr. REHBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REHBERG. Here in Washington, D.C., we are always reminded that freedom isn't free. Whether it's the self-reflective Vietnam War Memorial or the solemn Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery, the freedom we Americans enjoy today was paid for by the blood and sacrifice of our men and women in uniform.

While our veterans have paid this price with their sacrifices, there is another price they must pay which we can now alleviate. I have introduced the Veterans Pass Act, which will provide veterans an annual National Parks and Federal Lands pass at a sharp discount of \$10, down from the normal cost of \$80. I encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

The majestic beauty of our Nation's national parks are just as fitting a monument to the sacrifices of our soldiers as is a monument made of marble. We should make visiting these living monuments easier for our veterans. Please join me in cosponsoring the Veterans Pass Act.

## HEALTH CARE

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, health care reform is an essential component to our Nation's economic recovery. The expansion and reauthorization of the State Children's Health Insurance Program that was passed by this Congress and signed into law by President Obama expands health insurance to an additional 4 million children, covering 11 million children in all, including dental coverage and mental health parity.

The \$20 billion investment that we have made in health information technology in our Recovery and Reinvestment Act will modernize the health care system, saving money, reducing medical errors, improving quality, and creating health care jobs across all sectors.

The recovery package's \$87 billion in funding to the State Medicaid programs is a significant boost to our State's economy in Maryland. It is a budget gap filler for our State.

And finally, the President's budget, with an over \$630 billion down payment, prioritizes health care reform. At long last, the nearly 50 million people without health care will finally get their health care for all, quality, affordable, accessible health care for all. And I thank the President and this Congress for their leadership on health care.

## STOCK MARKET RECOVERY ACT

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, the stock market has rendered a bipartisan verdict on the policies of this Congress. From the year end to the inauguration, it fell 5 percent. From Secretary Geithner's speech to the budget, it fell 12 percent. From the budget to today, it fell another 11 percent.

We are now suffering from the fastest market decline ever, faster than even under Presidents Hoover or Roosevelt. The market has fallen in part because it has learned more about this Congress—record borrowing, rigged union elections, 9,000 earmarks, and nationalizing health care.

I think it's time to look at new policies to help stocks, like suspending the mark-to-market rule that triggers bank runs and restarting the uptick rule to undercut the short sellers.

Today, I will introduce the Stock Market Recovery Act with these two key reforms. We are digging an economic hole, and it's time to get out, and these reforms will help.

## GIVE OUR TEACHERS A HEAD START ACT

(Mr. WILSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Give Our Teachers a Head Start Act, a bill which makes strong investments in today's Head Start teachers and teachers' aides.

In this challenging economy, Head Start programs around the Nation are feeling the consequences. And when budget shortfalls hit these programs, it is the children who suffer. Many teachers and teachers' aides attempt to fill the gap and make personal financial sacrifices to provide their students with classroom supplies. The average Head Start teacher with a B.A. degree earns almost half of the average Kindergarten teacher, but is excluded from the current law permitting K-12 teachers an income tax deduction. This legislation would permit Head Start teachers and teachers' aides the ability to subtract from their gross income up to \$250 in expenses that would be associated with the purchase of classroom supplies.

When funding falls short and teachers sacrifice to fill the gap, it seems only fair that they should at least get a tax deduction. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

## FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TAKING LARGER PIECE OF TAXPAYERS' WALLETS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it appears the latest definition of fiscal responsibility in Washington is just to raise taxes in order to raise spending. The Federal Government takes a larger and larger piece of taxpayers' wallets.

At a time when American families and small businesses across our country are making tough decisions, Washington is borrowing more money. Never mind that tax hikes during a recession would only prolong the downturn or reduce job creation made in a recovery. This is the taxpayers' money, it does not belong to the government.

Let's take a lesson from the American taxpayer and promote tough decisions here that will reduce spending and not mortgage our children's futures. This spending will mean a \$9,014 principal obligation, along with adjustable interest, beginning now for every person 21 years old or younger.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

## WORKING TO IMPROVE HEALTH CARE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious challenges facing our Nation is the need for health care reform to ensure access to quality and affordable health care for all families.

It is shocking that nearly 46 million Americans in the United States have no health care coverage. Unless we act, estimates from the Congressional Budget Office warn that the number of Americans without health insurance will grow to about 54 million during the next 10 years.

In meeting with health care professionals and with my constituents in New Jersey, everyone agrees that changes in our current system are needed. Congress has already taken some important steps. Working with President Obama, we have enacted into law a much-needed expansion of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, to ensure that the 7 seven million children who currently participate in the program continue to receive coverage.

We also worked to provide \$20 billion in crucial funding in the economic recovery package to modernize our health care system through the adoption of health information technology.

Mr. Speaker, we want to see these moves continue.

## AMERICANS MAKE SACRIFICES WHILE WASHINGTON CONTINUES TO SPEND

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. After months of run-away spending at the Federal level on

bailouts, so-called stimulus bills, and big government spending in last year's budget, just last month President Obama unveiled his budget, a more than \$3 trillion blueprint for even more spending.

At a time when middle class families and small businesses are making sacrifices, Washington continues to spend trillions of dollars on bailouts and new government programs. One independent estimate suggests that the Federal Government will have to hire 250,000 new bureaucrats just to pass out all the money. And the President's plan includes the largest tax increase in history. The majority of his tax increases will hit small business owners. And the new national energy tax will cost every American household up to \$3,100 per year.

The chairman of the Budget Committee, the Democrat, JOHN SPRATT, said, "This is not an easy budget to market for sure. The reason? Well, the President's budget spends too much, taxes too much, and borrows too much, and the American people know it."

## INVESTING IN AMERICA

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting to me to watch people stand there and start talking about the spending of the Federal Government over the past few months because the party that was in charge for the previous decade—even longer—in Congress and in the White House ran up record deficits while the American middle class income stayed flat. And yet, I didn't hear them on the floor worried about the middle class until just very recently.

I'm not really sure what they're upset about, except I think they're upset that we have decided to invest in ourselves and our country. We're going to invest in jobs; we're going to invest in the middle class; we're going to invest in infrastructure; we're going to invest in education. President Obama said, "Those who out-teach us will out-compete us." So we're investing in this country. We're investing in health care for the children, and investing for the elderly as well.

We cut taxes for the middle class. Yes, times are very difficult, and unfortunately, we are going to have to spend to stimulate, and spend to support our people and support our country. But where were they for the past decade?

## EMPLOYEE FREE CHOICE ACT

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Today, congressional Democrats are introducing the curiously named Employee Free Choice Act, which actually does the opposite of its title by taking away an employee's free choice to choose in secret whether or not to join a union.

Union leadership is elected by secret ballot, I was elected by a secret ballot, and the President of the United States was elected by a secret ballot.

In these tough economic times, no one can blame American workers for supporting measures they believe will create new jobs for them. I grew up in a union household, so I understand why workers support this legislation when they hear their leadership talk about how this is needed because workers' influence is declining in the United States. Unfortunately, their leadership's rhetoric just doesn't square with reality. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, union membership was just over 16 million in 2008, a 2.6 percent rise over 2007. This legislation lays waste to an employee's right to choose whether to join a union by secret ballot, which is too steep a price to pay.

#### FEDERAL TAXPAYER DOLLAR

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, a wise man once said, "Treat each federal tax dollar as if it was hard earned; it was—by a taxpayer."

The Democrats of this House need a reminder that every dollar they have been signing away is a hard-earned American dollar.

Let's take that \$787 billion stimulus bill that they passed and that the American taxpayers will have to repay. That's going to cost every taxpayer in this country over \$4,000. We know that Americans are hurting, that we are in a recession, and that now is no time to raise taxes and increase their share of this national debt. That's all money that they could be using for household necessities.

And they are a little bit weary when they hear about projects they're going to be required to fund, like a foot bridge in St. Louis, or \$8 billion for the Disneyland to Las Vegas train, or \$200,000 for tattoo removal, or millions for the Speaker's mouse.

So let's remember those wise words before we start signing off on all these pork barrel spending projects for special interests. Let's treat every Federal taxpayer dollar as what it is, hard earned by the Federal taxpayer.

#### AMERICANS DESERVE THE FULL STORY ON IMMIGRATION

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans deserve accurate stories about immigration issues, but the national media prevent that from happening.

Too often, the media only feature stories that support their bias, that include more quotes from pro-amnesty

sources than pro-enforcement sources, and they prey on emotions while ignoring facts. These articles paint a one-sided sympathetic picture of illegal immigrants, but fail to acknowledge they intentionally broke our laws, burdened taxpayers, and displaced legal workers.

For example, five out of six immigration stories in the New York Times over a recent 2-week period were obviously slanted. The same was true of six out of eight immigration articles in the Washington Post. Americans deserve better, and should insist that the media provide all the facts and not just give one side.

□ 1230

#### CARD CHECK

(Mr. CASSIDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, secret ballots say a lot about the societies that defend and preserve them. They say that society trusts the people, and given the facts and the arguments, the people themselves are trusted to make the right decisions. You can be persuaded. You can be begged. But in the privacy of the voting booth, your vote is your own.

When government attempts to abolish the private ballot, it says that people are not trusted. It says to every citizen, you, do not know what is good for you.

For over 60 years, American workers have decided whether to unionize in secret ballot elections, for the very same reasons that in political elections we cast our votes in private. Card check assaults that right. It imposes coercion over conscience, force over freedom.

Since 1776 Americans have expected Congress to defend their democratic rights, not abolish them. Card check denies fundamental democratic rights to over 100 million Americans. Congress should defend this right.

#### CAP AND TRADE CONCERNS

(Mr. CHAFFETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with deep concerns about the so-called "cap and trade" proposal. This is a new tax, a carbon tax, that would be levied upon every single American.

We were told that 95 percent of Americans would not see even "one dime" of increase in their taxes. Despite this rhetoric from the administration, 100 percent of Americans will pay this new tax. Every person, every business, every family will pay this new tax. Even Warren Buffet refers to this as a "regressive tax."

At a time when business is struggling and all Americans across the country are worried about the expenses of their daily lives, now, especially now, is not the time to raise taxes.

The President's budget spends too much, it taxes too much, and it borrows too much.

The new carbon tax, disguised in the green robe of "cap and trade," is not a tax the American people are willing to pay. I urge the American people to rise up against this tax and reject this unwarranted tax upon our families.

#### RECOGNIZING AND HONORING OUR TROOPS IN IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the opportunity to visit our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and was able to thank them personally for their selfless sacrifice and for their service to our country.

From the moment that I arrived in country along with five of our colleagues, there was an extreme sense of pride, purpose, and confidence in the soldiers we met. These troops are led by the finest military leaders in the world, such as General Ray Odierno, General David McKiernan, General Lloyd Austin, to name just a few, with each of their commands providing superb support.

So I come to the floor today with a message from the troops, a message that I found somewhat selfless, but not at all surprising coming from these fine men and women.

Mr. Speaker, they asked me to tell the stories of their success, that they're making a difference. That the cut-and-run strategy that politicians, who have absolutely zero battlefield let alone military experience, preach from this floor is not the support that they and their families expect or deserve.

So with that I tell you a story about a women's health clinic in Baghdad. This clinic, like many in Iraq, has intermittent electricity throughout the day and little, if any, after the sun goes down. After spending 28 years in healthcare, I can tell you that I know firsthand you cannot decide when a baby decides to be born or when an emergency occurs.

So what did our soldiers do? Well, they did a lot.

For example, they installed solar panels on the roof of the clinic and batteries to store that energy. That clinic is now operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, providing much needed care to women and babies in need.

And I assure you, Mr. Speaker, this is one of countless examples of what occurs daily in Iraq.

No, you won't read this in the newspaper or see it on cable TV, but, Mr. Speaker, it is precisely the type of action and goodwill that our young men and women in uniform perform on a daily basis that deserves recognition.

So I appreciate the opportunity to thank our troops and to share their message with you.



## WHAT WAS HE THINKING?

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in determining his pick for the new head of the SEC, President Obama called for a "shift in ethics on Wall Street" and then subsequently announced his selection of Mary Schapiro for the SEC chairmanship. The irony of this selection is hard to miss, especially given Schapiro's reputation for favoring brokers and the securities industry over investors.

As head of the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, Ms. Schapiro completely missed both the mortgage crisis and the Madoff \$50 billion Ponzi scheme defrauding hundreds of unknowing investors. Furthermore, Ms. Schapiro's record as a regulator demonstrates she has seldomly pursued tough action against big Wall Street firms who, we all know, have atrociously abused our regulatory processes.

And while President Obama has openly stated that "the regulators who were assigned to oversee Wall Street dropped the ball," he has picked Schapiro, someone who was "asleep at the switch," to steer the reform of the SEC.

Which leaves me with the question: What was he thinking?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

J. HERBERT W. SMALL FEDERAL  
BUILDING AND UNITED STATES  
COURTHOUSE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R.813) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 813

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

## SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 813.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 813, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

Judge Small has been a lifelong resident of Elizabeth City, North Carolina, and has dedicated 52 years to civil service. He served in the United States Navy for 3 years during World War II and, after leaving the service, received a law degree from the University of North Carolina Law School at Chapel Hill. He began his public career as a special counsel to the Congressional Committee on Intergovernmental Relations and later served for 8 years as county attorney for Pasquotank County. In 1979 he was elected Superior Court judge of the First Judicial District of North Carolina and served in that position for 17 years.

Judge Small has been an active volunteer serving on the board of directors of the Albemarle Hospital and the American Red Cross. He has received numerous awards and honors from the Jaycees, the Boy Scouts, Volunteer Firemen, Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary and Elks clubs.

In the 110th Congress, the House passed a similar bill, but unfortunately the Senate was unable to act on the legislation. I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for reintroducing this bill.

Judge Small is an outstanding jurist, mentor, and civic leader. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 813.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As you have just heard, this bill names a United States courthouse lo-

cated in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse." I too support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me start by thanking the gentlewoman for yielding 4 minutes to me to speak on a very important issue in my congressional district, and that is the naming of this Federal courthouse in Elizabeth City, North Carolina. I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his kind remarks about my good friend Judge Small.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honor to a constituent, a friend, and a community leader by naming the Federal building in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building." I would also like to thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the ranking member, Mr. MICA, for their leadership in ushering this bill through the committee process. I would also like to thank each member of the North Carolina delegation, both Democrat and Republican, for their support of this legislation.

Almost 2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, this identical bill passed the House with unanimous support, but, regrettably, it was not taken up in the other body. I am confident that the Senate will see the bill through the process this session so we can now bestow this great honor upon Judge Small.

Mr. Speaker, Judge Small is a lifelong resident of Elizabeth City, North Carolina. He has dedicated 52 years of his professional life to improving the lives of the residents of Eastern North Carolina and in particular the Albemarle region. He began to practice law in Elizabeth City 2 years after I was born, 1949, after graduating from the University of North Carolina Law School at Chapel Hill. So the UNC fans have two reasons to celebrate today: the naming of this Federal building as well as the great victory that we saw this weekend.

Judge Small served as special counsel to the Congressional Committee on Intergovernmental Relations and later served 8 years as county attorney for Pasquotank County. He was elected district attorney for the First Judicial District of North Carolina for three consecutive terms.

As a young lawyer, I opposed Herb Small in the courtroom on several occasions. I was a defense lawyer; he was the prosecutor. He was a strong and effective district attorney. During his tenure, he served as chairman of the District Attorneys Advisory Committee, was president of the District Attorneys Association, and was appointed by the Governor to the State "Jail Study" Commission.

In 1979 Herb Small was elected Superior Court judge of the First Judicial



District. In the early years of his judgeship, I again had the opportunity to argue cases before his court. He was a firm but fair judge, always treated everyone who came before him with great respect. Herb Small served as resident Superior Court judge for 17 long years and was elected president of the North Carolina Conference of Superior Court Judges and represented the Conference on the North Carolina Policy and Sentencing Commission. I am proud to have been able to call Judge Small my judicial colleague when I became a judge after I was elected as a resident Superior Court judge in 1988. While Judge Small preceded me on the bench by almost a decade, he welcomed me among the ranks and always offered guidance and insight.

Judge Small served as chairman of the Albemarle Hospital board of directors and as chairman of the American Red Cross Chapter. He has been actively engaged in other civic, charitable, and service organizations, including Jaycees, Boy Scouts, Volunteer Firemen, Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, Elks Club, and Red Men. He was given the Distinguished Service Award by the Jaycees, the Volunteer of the Year Award by the Chamber of Commerce, and the Order of Long Leaf Pine by our great State of North Carolina for outstanding community involvement. During World War II, Judge Small served 3 years in the United States Navy.

Judge Small has been married for 57 years to Mrs. Annette Ward Small, a very delightful lady. They have four children, Elizabeth, John, Fran, and Carol; and they have nine grandchildren.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman for the additional minute. When I get talking about Judge Small, I get carried away, Mr. Speaker. He's such a dear friend.

Judge Small has been married for 57 years to Mrs. Annette Ward Small. They have four children, and I mentioned their names. They have nine grandchildren, Rachel, Matthew, John, Mary, Margaret, Ruth, Allison, Katie, and Chris.

I can think of no finer individual, no person who's more deserving of this honor than Judge J. Herbert Small. The people of Elizabeth City and the First Congressional District of North Carolina are grateful for his commitment to community and his great and extraordinary leadership.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would be remiss without thanking the gentleman from North Carolina for his persistence, for his leadership, for fighting for this. And as you have heard today he does so with great passion for someone who he admired greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 813, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street, in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

Judge Small has been a life-long resident of Elizabeth City, North Carolina, and has dedicated 52 years to civil service.

He served in the United States Navy for three years during World War II and, after leaving the service, received a law degree from the University of North Carolina Law School at Chapel Hill.

In 1949, he began his legal career as a Special Counsel to the Congressional Committee on Intergovernmental Relations and later served for eight years as a county attorney for Pasquotank County.

In 1979, he was elected Superior Court Judge of the First Judicial District of North Carolina, and served in that position for 17 years.

Throughout his life, Judge Small has been an active volunteer, serving on the Board of Directors of the Albemarle Hospital, and the American Red Cross. He has received numerous awards and honors from the Jaycees, the Boy Scouts, Volunteer Fireman, Chamber of Commerce, and the Rotary and Elks clubs.

In the 110th Congress, the House passed a similar bill but, unfortunately, the Senate was unable act on the legislation. I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for reintroducing this bill.

Judge Small is an outstanding mentor and volunteer. For over five decades, he has been an exceptional jurist and civic leader. It is fitting and proper to honor his outstanding contributions with this designation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 813.

□ 1245

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 813.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RONALD H. BROWN UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS BUILDING

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 837) to designate the Federal building located at 799 United Nations Plaza in New York,

New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 837

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 799 United Nations Plaza in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 837.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 837, a bill to designate the U.S. Mission to the United Nations Building located at 799 United Nations Plaza, New York City, New York, as the Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building.

We all acknowledge Ron Brown as an extraordinary man. He wore many hats—lawyer, pragmatic bridge builder, statesman, mentor and trusted and true friend. As we are all aware, he was the first African American Secretary of Commerce. In that position he became a powerful and influential voice for promoting American products and trade abroad.

He left the National Urban League in 1979 to work for Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, who sought the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination. In 1981, Brown began a career as a lawyer and lobbyist. In 1988, he was elected chairman of the Democratic National Committee. From 1989 to 1992, he served as chairman and used his skills as a negotiator and pragmatic bridge builder to help reunite the Democratic Party after its defeat in the 1988 Presidential election.

In 1993, President William J. Clinton appointed Ron Brown as Secretary of Commerce. During his tenure, Secretary Brown effectively utilized and expanded the role of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Secretary Brown

was known for his amiable political style and his deft skill in negotiations. As secretary, he used these qualities effectively to promote U.S. trade, expand foreign markets for American businesses and spur domestic job growth and economic development.

Secretary Brown's life was tragically ended in April 1996 when he was killed in a plane crash while in service to his country. It is fitting and proper we honor his civic contributions by this designation, and I urge passage of H.R. 837.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As you just heard from the gentlewoman from Maryland, this bill names the Federal building located in the United Nations Plaza in New York as the Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building.

This bill has already passed the House once before and, as you have heard the explanation, here it is in front of us.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 837, a bill to designate the United States Mission to the United Nations Building located at 799 First Avenue, New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building".

Enactment of this legislation is long overdue. I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his steadfastness in supporting this bill. Congressman RANGEL introduced similar bills in the 108th, 109th, and 110th Congresses.

Last Congress, the House passed H.R. 735, to designate the United States Mission to the United Nations in honor of Ron Brown. Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to act on the bill. I am pleased that today we will again pass this bill and pay a fitting tribute to the life and achievements of this extraordinary American.

Ron Brown was a man who served his country in many capacities: lawyer, pragmatic bridge builder, statesman, mentor, and trusted friend.

He may be best known for his service as the first African-American Secretary of Commerce. In that position, he became a powerful and influential voice for promoting American products and trade abroad. He championed expanding markets for U.S. goods and services, in order to increase job opportunities and foster job creation here at home.

He also served President Clinton on the National Economic Council, the Domestic Policy Council, the Task Force on National Health Care Reform, the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee, and the U.S.-Russia Business Development Committee.

Secretary Brown served on the Board of Trustees for Middlebury College and received his law degree from St. John's University in New York City. Prior to entering public service, he worked as a welfare caseworker in New York City.

In addition to his many talents and strengths, Secretary Brown was a passionate civil rights activist with a distinguished record of service to his community. His commitment to this nation and its citizens provides a model for us all.

Secretary Brown's life tragically ended in April 1996, when he was killed in a plane crash in Croatia while on an official Department of Commerce trade mission.

The Department of State requested that Secretary Brown personally undertake the trade mission to highlight and find opportunities for U.S. businesses to boost economic reconstruction of the war torn region of former Yugoslavia.

Congress has previously designated four Federal buildings that serve as Department of State facilities. In 2000, Congress designated the Department of State headquarters as the "Harry S Truman Federal Building" (P.L. 106-218). In 2004, Congress designated the Foreign Service Institute as the "George P. Schultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center" (P.L. 108-136). In 2005, Congress designated the United States Embassy Annex in Rome, Italy, as the "Mel Sembler Building" (P.L. 108-447) and designated the Federal building in Kingston, Jamaica, as the "Colin L. Powell Residential Plaza" (P.L. 109-89).

Secretary Brown died in service to his country. It is fitting and proper to honor this Federal building as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building". I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 837.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remaining part of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 837.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### R. JESS BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 842) to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 842

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Courthouse to be constructed at the site bounded on the north by Court Street, on the west by West Street, on the south by South Street, and on the east by President Street in Jackson, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 842.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 842, a bill to designate the courthouse to be built in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse. Attorney Brown was a towering figure in the history of the civil rights movement in the South and especially in Mississippi. He was a native son of Kansas, born in Coffeyville, Kansas, and raised in Muskogee, Oklahoma. He received his law degree from Texas Southern University and practiced law in Mississippi in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s.

As Associate Counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Brown filed the first civil rights suit in Mississippi in the 1950s in Jefferson Davis County seeking the enforcement of the right of black citizens to become registered voters.

In 1961, Brown represented James H. Meredith in his suit to be allowed to enter the University of Mississippi. His victory in this case opened the doors of that university to all of Mississippi's citizens.

While with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, he played a major role in fighting discrimination in the areas of transportation and other public accommodations working alongside Thurgood Marshall, who had later become Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

During his lifetime, he received numerous awards and honors, including the NAACP's Lawyer of the Year award, National Bar Association C. Francis Stradford Award, which is their highest award, and Mississippi Teachers Association award for extraordinary service to education in Mississippi.

I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me to pass H.R. 842.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we just heard, this bill names the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

R. Jess Brown grew up and was educated in the public school system of Muskogee, OK. He attended Illinois State University, Indiana University, and the Texas Southern Law School.

Mr. Brown was actively involved in civil rights issues and dedicated his career to pursuing equality for all citizens.

In 1948, he was a co-plaintiff in a lawsuit brought on behalf of African-American teachers in Jackson, MS, seeking equal pay.

After being admitted to the bar in Mississippi, he became Associate Counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense and Educational Fund.

As Associate Counsel, he filed a civil rights case in Mississippi seeking to enforce the right of African Americans to register to vote.

Later, in 1961, Mr. Brown represented James H. Meredith in a lawsuit that was filed and won. This case opened the door to allow Mr. Meredith and other African Americans to enter and study at the University of Mississippi.

Mr. Brown was active in many other cases that helped to break down barriers related to discrimination in the areas of public transportation and accommodations.

He was a leader not only in the civil rights movement, but also more broadly in the legal community. Among his many accomplishments, he co-founded the Magnolia Bar Association, served on the Board of the National Bar Association, and was admitted to practice law before the United States Supreme Court.

I have no objections to the passage of this bill and support its adoption.

I understand the other side has a speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 842, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse under construction in Jackson, Mississippi, as the R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown was born September 12, 1912, in Coffeyville, Kansas. His parents, Ernestine and Joe Brown, were jazz musicians, vaudeville performers and theater managers.

Jess received a bachelor of science in industrial arts from Illinois State Normal University and a master of science in education in the area of industrial education from Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana.

After teaching at Alcorn State University, Mr. Brown moved to Jackson, Mississippi, where he taught industrial arts at Lanier High School, the only black high school in the City of Jackson, Mississippi, at that time. While teaching at Lanier, Mr. Brown became an intervening plaintiff in a lawsuit that sought equal pay for all teachers in Jackson, Mississippi.

After teaching in Jackson, Jess attended Texas Southern University Law School. Jess left the law school before receiving his juris doctorate, but was able to go back to Mississippi and pass

the Mississippi bar in 1953. After passing the bar, Mr. Brown began practicing law in Vicksburg, Mississippi.

As a young lawyer, Jess confined his practice to cases involving divorces, deeds, land titles and other practices that did not disturb white members of the bar. However, after the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education ruling, Brown felt compelled to defend the civil rights of African Americans.

In the fall of 1955, the conditions and hardships endured by black lawyers in the courts led Mr. Brown and seven other black attorneys to establish the Magnolia Bar Association. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown is credited with filing the first civil rights lawsuit in Mississippi. This lawsuit, on behalf of a Jefferson County minister, challenged laws that prevented blacks from voting.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown has an extensive record as a civil rights lawyer. Among his many cases, Mr. Brown represented Clyde Kennard after he was arrested while trying to enroll at the University of Southern Mississippi.

Jess served as co-counsel for James Meredith's lawsuit to enter the University of Mississippi. This case was the ultimate cause of the integration of that university.

Mr. Brown represented Dr. Gilbert Mason when he and others were arrested in their efforts to end racial segregation on the beaches of Biloxi, Mississippi.

He represented Medgar Evers and Dr. Aaron Henry as they fought for civil rights in the 1960s and 1970s.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brown was admitted to practice law before all courts in Mississippi, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Brown also served on the executive board of the National Bar Association for approximately 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, on January 2, 1990, R. Jess Brown died in Jackson, Mississippi, at the age of 77.

Mr. Speaker, R. Jess Brown did many great things for the people of Mississippi, and he has received many accolades for his accomplishments. As I stand here today, in part because of the efforts of Jess Brown, I can think of few other people as worthy of having their name on the Mississippi courthouse under construction in Jackson, Mississippi, as R. Jess Brown.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 842.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 842, a bill to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

R. Jess Brown was born in Coffeyville, Kansas, on September 2, 1912. He was educated in the Muskogee, Oklahoma public schools, and later received a Bachelor of Education from Illinois State Normal University in 1935, a

Master of Education from the University of Indiana in 1943, and a Juris Doctorate from Texas Southern Law School.

He was admitted to the bar for the State of Mississippi in 1953 and admitted to practice before the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi. In 1955, he co-founded the Magnolia Bar Association, and he later served on the Board of the National Bar Association for nearly 15 years. In 1958, he was admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

As associate counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Brown filed the first civil rights suit in Mississippi seeking the enforcement of the right of black citizens to become registered voters. In 1961, Brown represented James H. Meredith in his suit to enter the University of Mississippi, and his victory in this case opened the doors of that University to all of Mississippi's citizens. During his time at the NAACP, Brown also played a major role in fighting discrimination in the areas of transportation and other public accommodations working alongside Thurgood Marshall, who would later become a United States Supreme Court Justice.

Brown also served as counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union, where he was successful in obtaining reversals of convictions of black defendants because of discrimination in jury selection. He represented numerous black defendants in cases where the State sought the death penalty, and as a result of these appeals, none of these defendants were ever executed.

R. Jess Brown died in Jackson, Mississippi, on January 2, 1990. He will be remembered as a brilliant attorney, an accomplished civil rights leader, and as a great American. It is appropriate that the U.S. Courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi be designated the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse".

In the 110th Congress, the House passed a similar bill to name the U.S. Courthouse in Jackson, Mississippi, after R. Jess Brown. Regrettably, the Senate was unable to act on the legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me once again in supporting this designation and I urge the passage of H.R. 842.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if I may inquire from the gentlelady from Maryland if she has any other speakers at this time?

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I have no further speakers at this time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 842.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

# SCOTT REED FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURT-HOUSE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 869) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 869

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, shall be known and designated as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

## SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 869.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 869, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States Courthouse located at 101 Barr Street, Lexington, Kentucky, as the Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

From 1964 until 1969, Judge Reed was a member of the First Division of the Fayette Circuit Court when he was elected to the Kentucky Court of Appeals, then the highest court in the State, and was chosen by his colleagues on the Court of Appeals as Chief Justice. He became the first Chief Justice of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. His opinions from the Supreme Court of Kentucky were highly regarded and often cited by other jurisdictions. Judge Reed was a member of the Amer-

ican, Kentucky, and Fayette County Bar Associations.

On November 2, 1979, President Jimmy Carter appointed him as a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. He became a Senior Judge August 1, 1988, and retired April 1, 1990.

He was a frequent lecturer to the National College of Trial Judges and was named to the Hall of Distinguished Alumni of the University of Kentucky on April 11, 1980.

Judge Reed was an exemplary lawyer and outstanding jurist. His public career serving the citizens of Kentucky spanned over 30 years. He served with great distinction at both the State and Federal judicial levels. It is both fitting and proper to honor his civic contributions with this designation, and I urge support for passage of H.R. 869.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, this bill designates the Federal building and United States Courthouse located on Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, the Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of the building, 799 United Nations Plaza, being named after my late friend, Ronald Brown. I want to thank his family and his community, the central Harlem community, for the support that they have given to this bill, as well as the community who loved and respected him all of his life. I want to thank Chairmen OBERSTAR and HOLMES NORTON for allowing this to become a part of our American history.

Ron Brown was an extraordinary human being. He was born in 1941. My relationship to him was really outstanding since, while I was in school, I was the desk clerk at a rather famous hotel in Harlem called the Theresa Hotel. Ron Brown's father was the manager of that hotel. So I got to know Ron at a very, very early age, and was able to see the remarkable career that he staked out for himself. Bright, articulate. He was one of those type of Americans that could do most anything that he wanted to do.

He worked for Senator KENNEDY; he went to St. John's Law School; he worked for the Urban League. He became an outstanding member of the Democratic Party. But the most remarkable thing about Ron Brown is that as Secretary of Commerce under the Clinton administration, he became one of the greatest ambassadors that the American government ever had abroad.

It wasn't that he was just extending trade and getting people to buy our goods and services. It's that he was extending love, attention, sensitivity and, especially in the developing countries, where we had not spent the time that we should have, he not only sold our wares, but he was able to sell our reputation as a country that wanted to help other countries.

And so it is with a great deal of pleasure for those of us from Harlem, those of us from New York, those of us who understood and knew Ron Brown, and even the Clinton administration, who gave him this great opportunity to have a building named right across from the United Nations, which would have the responsibility for all of the member nations, as well as the employees there, to be able to establish American policies and embassies throughout the world, that there will be a little bit of Ron Brown's reputation as being a great American in everything that we are able to do in that building.

So, I thank you so much for giving me this opportunity to join with the millions of Americans who believe that Ron Brown made us taller, made us more proud, and certainly more respected. God has taken his life far too early, but we praise God for allowing him to share his wonderful life with us.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 869 is a bill to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

I can think of no other individual more deserving, no other public servant more worthy, and no other action more appropriate than naming the federal courthouse in Lexington after the Honorable Scott Elgin Reed. Prominent Central Kentucky attorney, first Chief Justice of the Kentucky Supreme Court, and federal judge—Scott Reed exemplifies the definition of honor and dignity.

Born in Lexington, Kentucky, on July 3, 1921, Scott Reed graduated with distinction from the University of Kentucky. While in college, he was editor-in-chief of the Kentucky Law Journal and awarded the order of Coif, the highest academic award that can be given to a law graduate. He was also a member of the Phi Delta Phi Fraternity. He achieved many honors at the University of Kentucky, including the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Medalion—a prestigious award recognizing outstanding character and humanitarian service.

Prior to his time on the bench, Scott Reed was County Attorney, retained as counsel for the Fayette County School Board, and distinguished himself as a trial lawyer of great integrity.

He served from 1948 through 1956 as an acting associate professor at the University of Kentucky College of Law. From 1964 until 1969, he was judge of the First Division of the Fayette Circuit Court. He then was elected to the Kentucky Court of Appeals.

As Chief Judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals, Judge Reed oversaw the passage of a constitutional amendment that unified and modernized Kentucky's court system. As part of the modernization, the Court of Appeals became the Kentucky Supreme Court. Reed was

elected by his fellow justices to be the first Chief Justice of Kentucky.

As Chief Justice, he oversaw the implementation of a constitutional amendment leading Kentucky to have one of the most efficient court systems in the country. The Chief Justice of the Commonwealth holds equal rank with the Governor, the latter being the head of the Executive Branch and Chief Justice serving as head of the Judiciary.

He was elected as a Fellow in the National College of the Judiciary in 1965 and was a voting member of the American Law Institute, a body of scholarly people who shape the laws of our nation. The opinions written by Scott Reed during his time on the Supreme Court of Kentucky have received national acclaim for their scholarly content. Judge Reed was a frequent lecturer to the National College of Trial Judges and has achieved the highest honors that can be bestowed on a member of his profession.

In 1979, he was appointed by Jimmy Carter to be U.S. district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. He served as a U.S. district judge until he retired in 1990. His federal legal scholarship was widely regarded and likened to that of Justices Brandeis, Holmes and Marshall. Scott Reed was named to the University of Kentucky College of Law Hall of Distinguished Alumni on April 11, 1980.

Judge Scott Reed passed away on February 17, 1994, but his legacy will always be a part of Kentucky's rich history. He deserves this honor, one that is indeed long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky for being a cosponsor of this legislation. I also want to thank my colleagues Ms. HOLMES NORTON and Mr. OBERSTAR for their help in bringing this legislation to the floor.

I support H.R. 869, and I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 869, a bill to designate the Federal building located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse." The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER) and his colleague from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Scott Reed was born in Lexington, Kentucky in 1921. He attended local schools and graduated from the University of Kentucky College of Law in 1945. While at the University, Reed received many awards and honors, including the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Medallion for excellence.

The first years of Judge Reed's career were spent in private practice, during which he distinguished himself as a trial lawyer of great integrity. During this time, he also taught at the University of Kentucky College of Law.

From 1964 to 1969, he was judge of the First Division of the Fayette Circuit Court. From 1969 until 1976, Judge Reed served on the Court of Appeals, 5th Appellate District. In 1976, he became the Chief Justice of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, a position which holds equal rank with the Governor. His opinions from the Supreme Court of Kentucky have received national attention for their scholarly content and careful judicial reasoning.

In August 1979, Judge Reed was nominated by President Carter to serve as the U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. He was confirmed in October 1979, and served until his death in 1994.

In the 110th Congress, the House passed similar legislation to designate the U.S. Courthouse in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse." Unfortunately, the Senate was unable to act on the bill.

Judge Reed enjoyed a rich and rewarding career. His contributions to the American judicial system are exceptional. It is fitting that the courthouse in Lexington bear his name to honor his distinguished career and enduring legacy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 869.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 869.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JAMES A. LEACH UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 887) to designate the United States courthouse located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the "James A. Leach United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 887

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, shall be known and designated as the "James A. Leach United States Courthouse".

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James A. Leach United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 887.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 887, a bill to designate the federal building in Davenport, Iowa, as the James A. Leach United States Courthouse.

Former Representative Leach began his public service career in 1965 as a staff person to then-Congressman Donald Rumsfeld. In 1968, Jim Leach joined the United States Department of State as a Foreign Service Officer and subsequently served as a special assistant to director at the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the 1970s, Representative Leach served in various capacities with the United Nations, the United States Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Our former colleague, Jim Leach was elected to the Congress in 1977 from Iowa and served for 14 consecutive Congresses. His contributions to, and interests in the House of Representatives, are numerous, including his long-standing support for use of HOPE VI HUD funds to help smaller cities develop affordable housing.

Jim Leach was hardworking, highly respected on both sides of the aisle, and dedicated to the welfare of his constituents. It is fitting and proper to honor his public service with this designation. I support H.R. 887, and urge the passage of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill names the United States Courthouse located on East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the James A. Leach United States Courthouse. As we recall, he was also a former colleague of ours here in this distinguished body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK).

Mr. LOEBSACK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I would like to take a few minutes today to honor the many accomplishments of my predecessor, former Congressman Jim Leach.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 887, to rename the United States Courthouse in Jim's hometown of Davenport, Iowa, as a tribute to his 30 years of service to Iowa's Second Congressional District. Jim's legacy of statesmanship; his leadership in foreign affairs and financial services issues; his dedication to public service; and his capable representation of his constituents left a lasting impact on the district I am now honored to represent.

As chairman of the Banking and Financial Services Committee, the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, Jim was a leader on some of the most important financial and foreign affairs issues of the past 30 years.

A native son of Iowa, Jim represented his constituents with grace, commitment, and the Iowa values with which he was raised. Indeed, his legacy of service has been highlighted through several awards, including the Norman Borlaug Award for Public Service.

Jim is now continuing that legacy as a faculty member at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, his alma mater. As a former member of the Foreign Service, where he served as a delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference and the United Nations General Assembly, I am confident that Jim brings a unique perspective to Princeton that is surely a tremendous asset for his students.

Indeed, as a former professor at Cornell College in Iowa, I invited Jim to guest lecture at the college. His knowledge and personal experiences were a highlight for my students, and make it clear why he holds eight honorary degrees.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Jim for his many years of service to Iowa and our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. I rise in support of H.R. 887, to honor my friend, former colleague and Congressman, Jim Leach. Jim's survival for three decades, winning election 14 times, and his strong record of principled, bipartisan leadership is a superb example to all of his colleagues, to all of us.

He was born in Davenport, Iowa, where he made a name for himself by winning the 1960 State Wrestling Championship for Davenport High School. He went on to earn an impressive set of degrees from Princeton University, Johns Hopkins University, and the London School of Economics.

Jim began his public service career in 1965 as a staffer to then-Congressman Don Rumsfeld. In 1968, he entered the Foreign Service, where he served as a delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference and the U.N. General Assembly. He resigned his commission in 1973 to protest President Richard Nixon's firing of the first Watergate special prosecutor, Archibald Cox.

Jim was first elected to represent Iowa's Second District in 1976. A political moderate who was always willing to reach across the aisle, Jim chaired the Ripon Society and the Republican Mainstream Committee, two organizations formed to encourage bipartisan policymaking. In Congress, Jim distinguished himself as a steadfastly ethical and independent-minded public servant.

Throughout his career, Jim supported diplomacy before unilateralism, pushing for full funding of U.S. obligations to the U.N. As chairman of the

Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus, Jim pressed for a comprehensive test ban and led the House debate on a nuclear freeze. Jim was also one of the only six House Republicans to vote against the 2002 Iraq War resolution.

Jim's post-congressional career has been no less extraordinary. He holds eight honorary degrees, and has received decorations from two foreign governments. He is a recipient of the Wayne Morse Integrity in Politics Award; the Woodrow Wilson Award from Johns Hopkins; the Adlai Stevenson Award from the United Nations Association; the Edgar Wayburn Award from the Sierra Club; and the Norman Borlaug Public Service Award.

Jim continues to serve the public on the boards of several public companies and nonprofit organizations, including the Century Foundation; the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; the Social Sciences Research Council; Pro Publica; and Common Cause, which he chairs.

Additionally, he is currently a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and teaches at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School as the John L. Weinberg Visiting Professor of Public and International Affairs.

Jim is not only a remarkable public servant, but a good friend. It was a tremendous honor to serve alongside him.

Just in closing, I'd like to say this. Jim Leach reminded me of a person that I knew in the legislature named Horace Daggett. Outstanding people in their own right in every way. Truly, community people. Iowans, Americans. And they put the country first.

Jim was a privilege to know, as the person he was, the person that he is, the person that reaches out and continues to serve us with distinction, and someone that we all can be very, very proud of.

So, I urge all to support H.R. 887.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to honor our great friend, Jim Leach, by naming the courthouse in Davenport, Iowa, after him. It is a well-deserved honor.

Jim Leach is missed around the Capitol because he was a resource of institutional knowledge, he shared his tremendous sense of humor and his insight. I always enjoyed his ability to bring thoughtfulness to the debate. Most importantly, Jim Leach was and remains a great advocate for the State of Iowa. Jim is also a great Iowa Hawkeye supporter because, of course, he had the Hawks in his district. I represent the University of Iowa's state rival, Iowa State University. Obviously, we had a lot to tease each other about throughout the years.

Jim Leach will be remembered here in this body for his 30 years of dedicated service and his great intellect. He was a well-rounded member. You could call on him to stop gambling predators over the Internet or, as someone who knew and understood the many facets of foreign affairs; we could seek his counsel during an international crisis. His talent was being able to bring that forth and convey complex subjects in a very kind and thoughtful way.

Jim Leach represents the very best of what constituents expect from their Representatives in Congress. His legacy is promoting bipartisanship, protecting the dignity of the House by standing as an example of putting thought before politics and actions over posturing. Jim is someone who I have the greatest personal respect for.

I'm pleased that Mr. LOEBSACK has brought this resolution to the floor of the House, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution in honor of former Representative James Leach.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 887, a bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa in honor of former Congressman Jim Leach.

I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) and the Iowa delegation for reintroducing this bill to honor one of Congress's most well-respected and well-liked Members. The House passed a similar bill, H.R. 1505, in the 110th Congress but unfortunately, the Senate was unable to act on the legislation.

Jim Leach was a learned Member of this Body and, to many of us, a trusted friend.

James Albert Smith Leach was born in Davenport, Iowa on October 15, 1942. He attended public schools in Davenport, received a Bachelor of Arts from Princeton University, and attended the London School of Economics.

In 1965, Congressman Leach began his public service career as a staff person to then-Congressman Donald Rumsfeld. In 1968, he joined the U.S. Department of State as a Foreign Service Officer and subsequently served as special assistant to the director at the Office of Economic Opportunity. In the 1970s, he served in various capacities with the United Nations, the United States Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

In 1976, Congressman Leach was elected to the United States House of Representatives; he would represent the 2nd District of Iowa for 30 years (1977–2007). During his time in Congress, he chaired the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and the Congressional-Executive Commission on China.

He holds eight honorary degrees, has received decorations from two foreign governments, and is the recipient of the Wayne Morse Integrity in Politics Award, the Woodrow Wilson Award from Johns Hopkins University, the Adlai Stevenson Award from the United Nations Association, and the Edger Wayburn Award from the Sierra Club.

In February 2007, Congressman Leach joined the faculty of Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs as a visiting professor.

In all aspects of his public career, he served the citizens of Iowa with distinction, hard work, and honor. This designation properly honors his outstanding public career and it is fitting to designate the Davenport, Iowa courthouse as the "James A. Leach United States Courthouse."

I support the bill and urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Jim Leach.

□ 1315

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.



Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 887.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 37) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

##### H. CON. RES. 37

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SOAP BOX DERBY RACES ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the "Association") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races, on the Capitol Grounds on June 20, 2009, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

#### SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Association shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

#### SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Association is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

#### SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

#### SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event to be carried out under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 37.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 37 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the annual Soapbox Derby. As Members are aware, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure authorizes use of the Capitol grounds each year for this worthwhile event.

The 2009 Greater Washington Soapbox Derby will take place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Second Street Northwest on June 22, 2009. The Greater Washington Soapbox Derby has been held on the U.S. Capitol grounds since 1991. It has attracted more than 60 youth participants in each of those years.

The D.C. metropolitan race winners from each of the stock, super stock, and master's division soapbox derby races throughout the world will compete in Akron, Ohio for scholarships and other prizes in the All-American Soapbox Derby.

The All-American Soapbox Derby Youth Program is administered by International Soapbox Derby, Incorporated, an Akron-based nonprofit corporation. Activities planned for this event will be coordinated with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and, like all events on Capitol Hill grounds, will be free and open to the public.

I extend my thanks to Majority Leader HOYER, who is and has been such a steadfast supporter of this event, and I urge passage of the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida. The timing around this place being such as it is, I appreciate a chance to speak to the Jim Leach Resolution, the resolution that names the United States Courthouse at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the James A. Leach United States Courthouse.

Jim Leach served in this Congress for over a quarter of a century and he had friends on both sides of the aisle. If you know Jim Leach, you know that he is an intellectual. He is an individual that his cerebrum, his cerebellum, and medulla oblongata were all connected and all functioning. And I say that because he has a significant ability to retain in his memory and manipulate the information.

He also is a champion wrestler. So his athletic and intellectual capabilities that he demonstrated here, mostly his intellectual capabilities on the floor of this House. Although I have felt that temptation on the athletic from time to time, not Jim Leach. Jim Leach was a consummate statesman, someone who could work with Democrats and the Republicans, and is an individual who was the epitome of the balance between the two as he served here in Congress and today contributes to our overall broader society.

So I am very pleased to rise in support of the resolution naming the Federal Courthouse in Davenport, Iowa, the James A. Leach Courthouse. And I am happy to call him a friend, a former colleague, and someone who has brought honor upon this institution every day of his service here in the United States House of Representatives. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to say that the soapbox derby on Capitol Hill is a way that young people are fully engaged, they are creative, in building their participant vehicles. And it is an excellent opportunity for parents to have a direct involvement in their children's activities right here on the Capitol grounds.

The Derby's mission is to provide children with an activity that promotes technical and social skills that will serve them throughout their lives. And the Derby organizers of course work with the Architect of the Capitol to make sure that the appropriate rules and regulations are in place during the event. I am confident that, once again, the event this year will be a huge success.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for her description of this bill. This is something that this House has done for many, many years. And for many years the distinguished majority leader, Mr. HOYER, has sponsored a resolution to authorize the use of the Capitol grounds for this event, and Congress has clearly supported it. It provides children a fun way to allow children to show off their dedication, their work, and creativity as they compete for trophies and the opportunity to race in other competitions.

Girls and boys between 8 and 17 will race down the Capitol Hill in their home-made cars. We are all looking forward to that. The winner of each division will then be qualified to compete in the National Soapbox Derby. I support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 37, to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

I especially want to acknowledge the dedication of our distinguished Majority Leader



(Mr. HOYER), who annually introduces this resolution to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for such a worthwhile event.

This year's Greater Washington Soap Box Derby is scheduled to take place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Third Street, N.W., in Washington, DC, on June 20, 2009. This will be the 68th running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

This annual event encourages all boys and girls, ages nine through 16, to construct and operate their own soap box vehicles. The event is supported by hundreds of volunteers and parents.

It is an excellent opportunity for parents to have direct involvement in their children's activities. The derby's mission is to provide children with an activity that promotes technical and social skills that will serve them throughout their lives.

The derby organizers will work with the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police to ensure the appropriate rules and regulations are in place during the event. I am confident that this year's event will once again be a huge success.

I urge my colleagues to join me in agreeing to H. Con. Res. 37.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise as a proud sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 37, legislation which will allow the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to hold the 68th Annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby on the grounds of the United States Capitol on Saturday, June 20.

Since 1938, when 223 racers descended on Washington, DC, soap box derby racing has had a long and rich tradition in our Nation's Capital.

Although the race location has moved from the original site on New Hampshire Avenue to Capitol Hill, with stops on Massachusetts Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue, and Eastern Avenue along the way, the ingredients of the race remain the same: home-made engine-less, gravity-powered cars, the spirit of competition, and the pure exhilaration of racing.

The soap box derby consists of dozens of drivers, boys and girls ranging in age from 8 to 17, who have designed and built the cars they race.

These racers are divided into three divisions: stock, super stock, and masters. The local winner of each division will automatically qualify to compete with racers from around the country in the 72nd All-American Soap Box Derby in Akron, Ohio on July 25.

Community groups, police departments, fire departments, and others sponsor children each year, children who may not otherwise be able to participate.

Over the years thousands of the region's young people have participated in this great race. I am proud to report that the last two winners of the Soap Box Derby competition have been neighbors of mine and constituents of the Fifth District of Maryland.

In 2007 Miss Kacie Rader, a neighbor of mine from Mechanicsville, Maryland, and a rising senior in high school at the time, won in the masters division of the 66th Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. Kacie then went on to become the first Marylander to win the national soap box derby title, after competing against 550 other soap box champions.

Kacie's great success was followed last year by another winner, Miss Courtney Rayle. Sixteen years old and also a neighbor from

Mechanicsville, Maryland, Courtney won the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby in June 2008. She became the seventh person in her family to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this event has been called "the greatest amateur racing event in the world" and it is an excellent opportunity for the contestants from the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia to learn basic building skills while gaining a real sense of accomplishment.

The soap box derby is not just a race. It is an enriching way to engage our youth, and teach them the importance of ingenuity, commitment, and hard work.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to join with me and the other original cosponsors, Representatives CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, FRANK WOLF, JAMES MORAN, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, DONNA EDWARDS, and GERRY CONNOLLY, in supporting this resolution.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 37.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 38

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 28th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (in this resolution referred to as the "event"), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2008.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 15, 2009, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

#### SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

#### SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

#### SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Maryland.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Concurrent Resolution 38.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 38, which authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the 28th National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

According to the National Law Enforcement Fund, 140 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty in 2008. These officers will be honored at this memorial service. During 2008, 15 women officers were killed; the average age of all officers killed was 40 years; and the average years of service was 12 years. According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, there are more than 900,000 sworn law enforcement officers now serving in the United States.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation which designated May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day, and the week in which that date falls as Police Week. This first official memorial service took place on May 15, 1982, at which 91 law enforcement officers were honored. Over the past 28 years, the memorial service has honored over 3,000 law enforcement officers from around our Nation. This event has become one in a series of well-attended events during Police Week. I urge support for this resolution.

Activities on the Capitol grounds conducted under House Concurrent Resolution 38 will be coordinated with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and will be free and open to the public. I support this resolution and urge its passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Maryland has done a great job explaining this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 38, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service on May 15, 2009.

In October 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation which designated May 15th as National Peace Officers' Memorial Day, and the week in which that date falls as "Police Week". Each year on this day, our country honors the devotion and service of the peace officers who protect our neighborhoods, our cities, our friends, and our families.

This year's Memorial Service will honor the more than 140 Federal, state, and local law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2008, and will mark the 28th time the Capitol grounds will be used for this noteworthy event. During 2008, 41 officers were killed by gun fire, 71 officers were killed in traffic related accidents, and 15 women were killed in the line of duty.

Activities on the Capitol Grounds conducted under H. Con. Res. 38 will be coordinated with the Architect of the Capitol, will be free, and open to the public.

The selfless work of our police and firemen has always been a model of courage and moral strength. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 38.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 38.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) authorizing the use of

the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 39

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DC SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On June 5, 2009, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 2009 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the "event") may be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games.

#### SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

#### SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

#### SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Concurrent Resolution 39.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the District of Columbia's Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run. The Capitol Police, along with the D.C. Special Olympics, will participate in the torch run to be held on June 5, 2009.

The Law Enforcement Torch Run for the Special Olympics is run nationwide by law enforcement officers, leading up to each State or national Special Olympics summer games.

Each year, nearly 50 local and Federal law enforcement agencies in Washington, D.C., participate to show their

support of the D.C. Special Olympics. This torch relay event is a traditional part of the opening ceremonies for the Special Olympics.

Since its inception, over 15,000 District of Columbia citizens with disabilities have participated in the Special Olympics. Funds raised from the Law Enforcement Torch Run for the Special Olympics helps support year-round training and programs for Special Olympics in the District of Columbia. This type of support led to seven Special Olympics athletes competing in the Penn relays in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 2008.

The D.C. Special Olympics will work closely with the Capitol Police and the Architect of the Capitol to make sure that the event is in full compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol grounds. The event will be free and open to the public. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 39 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the District of Columbia's Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be held on June 5 of this year.

The Special Olympics is an internationally recognized organization dedicated to enriching the lives of children and adults with disabilities through athletic competition and through athletic events in general.

The Law Enforcement Torch Run is the largest grassroots effort that raises funds and awareness for the Special Olympics program, Mr. Speaker. The event in D.C. is one of the many law enforcement torch runs throughout the country and across 35 Nations leading up to the summer Special Olympics.

□ 1330

The Torch Run is a special event during which members of law enforcement run the "Flame of Hope" to the site of the local Special Olympics games.

Mr. Speaker, this event has become a regular occurrence on the Capitol Grounds. And this year's event will represent the 24th time it has occurred on these grounds. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this resolution along with the chairwoman of our Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management.

I support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

If I may at this time, Mr. Speaker, if I might inquire of the gentlewoman from Maryland if she has any further speakers.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I may have additional speakers, and I reserve the time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the time.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the D.C. Special Olympics is a

really premier event in this region that highlights the athletic accomplishments of children and adults with disabilities. I would like to recognize and give special thanks to the tenacity of Eunice Kennedy Shriver and her family for exceptional work on behalf of persons with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, as a young person I volunteered with the Special Olympics each year. And I recognize the talents, training and athleticism of young people from around the country and even from my congressional district. And each year law enforcement officers around the world participate in the local Torch Run events to raise money and awareness for the Special Olympics. In fact in 2008, the Law Enforcement Torch Run raised over \$34 million for the Special Olympics. And here in the Washington, D.C. area, law enforcement officers who are part of the extensive volunteer network that support the games carry the "Flame of Hope" across the Capitol Grounds through the District of Columbia to Catholic University.

It is an amazing event. The event is scheduled of course to occur on June 5, 2009. And it will be open to the public and is free of charge on the Capitol Grounds. The games are a wonderful expression of inclusiveness and confirmation of individual contribution.

I enthusiastically support this resolution. And I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for presenting the resolution to us and this very worthwhile endeavor of the Special Olympics.

I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I certainly support this resolution. The Special Olympics is a wonderful program. Certainly using Capitol Grounds is appropriate. Americans all over the country and certainly here revere this Capitol, as well we all should.

In a couple of minutes, we will be voting on a privileged resolution that I have offered. This is the third one. It is similar to the others that have been offered but it differs a little. It is a bit narrowed.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, as much as we revere this institution, there is a cloud hanging over it. And that cloud is that there are investigations going on right now at the Department of Justice investigating the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. And as long as that is occurring without this body doing anything, there will be a cloud hanging over this institution.

Now some may say as long as other bodies outside of Congress are investigating this issue, that Congress has no obligation to do so. I think that is wrong. We have an obligation to uphold the dignity and decorum of this body.

And we haven't been doing it very well. And as long as these investigations are swirling around us and we fail to act, then this cloud remains.

Some have mentioned that, in fact in one of the papers today, it referenced that this investigation is a Republican-led effort to embarrass the Democrats because the Democrats embarrassed Republicans beforehand. It is nothing of the sort. I did not consult with my party leadership before offering this resolution. I have not consulted with them during it. This is not a partisan resolution.

This is a bipartisan problem. The problem is that the perception is that earmarks are influencing campaign contributions and that campaign contributions are influencing earmarks. And there is really no other way to look at the situation but to draw that conclusion. That is why we need to vote on this resolution and allow the Ethics Committee to look into it.

Again this is not a partisan issue. This is a problem that afflicts both sides. I hope my colleagues see it that way. And we simply cannot allow this body to have the cloud hanging over it as it is right now.

And so I would encourage my colleagues, when it comes time to vote for this resolution, I'm sorry, vote against the tabling of the resolution, which would allow the Ethics Committee to look into it.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I have no further speakers at this time on this resolution.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for doing a great job in leading us through all the bills. She has done a wonderful job. I thank her for her leadership today.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would yield back.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman from Florida for his patience today.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 39, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The District of Columbia Special Olympics is the premier event in this region that highlights the athletic accomplishments of children and young adults with disabilities. I'd like to recognize and give special thanks to the tenacity to Eunice Kennedy Shriver and her family for exceptional work on behalf of persons with disabilities.

Each year, law enforcement officers around the world participate in local Torch Run events to raise money and awareness for the Special Olympics. In 2008, the Law Enforcement Torch Runs raised over \$34 million for the Special Olympics.

In the Washington D.C. area, law enforcement officers, who are part of the extensive volunteer network that support the games, carry the "Flame of Hope" across the Capitol Grounds through the District of Columbia to Catholic University.

This event, scheduled to occur on June 5, 2009, will be open to the public and free of charge. The sponsors will work with the Capitol Police Bureau to ensure that all rules and regulations pertaining to the use of the Capitol Grounds are followed.

These games are a wonderful expression of inclusiveness and a confirmation of individual contribution. I enthusiastically support this resolution and the very worthwhile endeavor of the Special Olympics.

I urge my colleagues to join me in agreeing to H. Con. Res. 39.

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 39.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution previously noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 228

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that "a top defense-lobbying firm" that "specializes in obtaining earmarks in the defense budget for a long list of clients" was "recently raided by the FBI.":

Whereas the Associated Press reported on February 25, 2009 that the "FBI searched the lobbying firm... and the residence of its founder...":

Whereas The Hill reported on March 4, 2009, that the firm "has given \$3.4 million to 284 Members of Congress":

Whereas Politico reported on February 13, 2009, that "federal investigators are asking about thousands of dollars in campaign contributions to lawmakers as part of an effort to determine whether they were illegal 'straw man' donations.":

Whereas Roll Call reported on February 20, 2009, that they have "located tens of thousands of dollars worth of [the raided firm]-linked donations that are improperly reported in the FEC database.":

Whereas Roll Call also reported that "tracking Federal Election Commission records of campaign donations attributed to [the firm] is a comedy of errors, misinformation and mysteries, providing more questions than answers about how much money the lobbying firm actually raised for Congressional campaigns.":

Whereas CQ Today reported on February 19, 2009, that "104 House members got earmarks for projects sought by [clients of the firm] in the 2008 defense appropriations bills," and that 87 percent of this bipartisan group of Members received campaign contributions from the raided firm:

Whereas The Hill reported on February 10, 2009, that in 2008 clients of this firm had "received \$299 million worth of earmarks, according to Taxpayers for Common Sense.":

Whereas The Hill reported on February 23, 2009, that “clients of a defense lobby shop under investigation are continuing to score earmarks from their patrons in Congress, despite the firm being on the verge of shutting its doors permanently” and that several of the firm’s clients “are slated to receive earmarks worth at least \$8 million in the omnibus spending bill funding the federal government through the rest of fiscal 2009...”;

Whereas the Washington Post reported on June 13, 2008, in a story describing increased earmark spending in the House version of the fiscal year 2009 defense authorization bill that “many of the earmarks serve as no-bid contracts for the recipients.”;

Whereas the Associated Press reported on February 25, 2009, that “the Justice Department’s fraud section is overseeing an investigation into whether [the firm] reimbursed some employees for campaign contributions to members of Congress who requested the projects.”;

Whereas Politico reported on February 12, 2009, that “several sources said FBI agents have spent months laying the groundwork for their current investigation, including conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions.”;

Whereas House Resolution 189, instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate the relationship between earmark requests already made by Members and the source and timing of past campaign contributions, was considered as a privileged matter on February 25, 2009, and the motion to table the measure was agreed to by recorded vote of 226 to 182 with 12 Members voting present;

Whereas House Resolution 212, instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate the relationship between earmark requests already made by Members on behalf of clients of the raided firm and the source and timing of past campaign contributions, was considered as a privileged matter on March 3, 2009, and the motion to table the measure was agreed to by recorded vote of 222 to 181 with 14 Members voting present;

Whereas the reportedly fraudulent nature of campaign contributions originating from the raided firm, as well as reports of the Justice Department conducting research on earmarks and campaign contributions, raise concern about the integrity of congressional proceedings and the dignity of the institution; and

Whereas the fact that cases are being investigated by the Justice Department does not preclude the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from taking investigative steps: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That (a) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, or an investigative subcommittee of the committee established jointly by the chair and ranking minority member, shall immediately begin an investigation into the relationship between earmark requests for fiscal year 2009 already made by Members on behalf of clients of the raided firm and the source and timing of past campaign contributions related to such requests.

(b) The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct shall submit a report of its findings to the House of Representatives within 2 months after the date of adoption of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

#### MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on tabling the resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules with regard to:

H.R. 813, by the yeas and nays, and

H.R. 842, by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 184, answered “present” 14, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—228

Ackerman  
Adler (NJ)  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (TN)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Driehaus  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Gonzalez

Gordon (TN)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Heinrich  
Hereth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kilroy  
Klein (FL)  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lowe  
Lujan  
Lynch  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Massa  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMahon  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)

Miller, George  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rohrabacher  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schradner  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner

Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns

Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

NAYS—184

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Austria  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Bartlett  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Boccheri  
Boehner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bright  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Deal (GA)  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly (IN)  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Ellsworth  
Emerson  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxo  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Guthrie  
Hall (TX)  
Halvorson  
Harper  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Himes  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Hunter  
Inglis  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan (OH)  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Kosmas  
Lamborn  
Lance  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee (NY)  
Lewis (CA)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McCotter  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Minnick  
Mitchell  
Moran (KS)  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Olson  
Paul  
Paulsen  
Pence  
Perriello  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radanovich  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Schock  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Teague  
Terry  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wamp  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—14

Barrett (SC)  
Bonner  
Butterfield  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Conaway  
Dent  
Hastings (WA)  
Kline (MN)  
Latham  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Poe (TX)  
Walden  
Welch

NOT VOTING—5

Abercrombie  
Blunt  
Cooper  
Miller, Gary  
Putnam

□ 1410

Messrs. SMITH of Texas and TEAGUE and Ms. JENKINS and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BERMAN and McMAHON and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Mr. BUTTERFIELD changed his vote from “yea” to “present.”

Mr. WALDEN changed his vote from “nay” to “present.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### J. HERBERT W. SMALL FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 813, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 813.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—427

Ackerman	Capito	Engel
Aderholt	Capps	Eshoo
Adler (NJ)	Capuano	Etheridge
Akin	Cardoza	Fallin
Alexander	Carnahan	Farr
Altmire	Carney	Fattah
Andrews	Carson (IN)	Filner
Arcuri	Carter	Flake
Austria	Cassidy	Fleming
Baca	Castle	Forbes
Bachmann	Castor (FL)	Fortenberry
Bachus	Chaffetz	Foster
Baird	Chandler	Fox
Baldwin	Childers	Frank (MA)
Barrett (SC)	Clarke	Franks (AZ)
Barrow	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Cleaver	Fudge
Barton (TX)	Clyburn	Gallely
Bean	Coble	Garrett (NJ)
Becerra	Coffman (CO)	Gerlach
Berkley	Cohen	Giffords
Berman	Cole	Gingrey (GA)
Berry	Conaway	Gohmert
Biggert	Connolly (VA)	Gonzalez
Billray	Conyers	Goodlatte
Billirakis	Costa	Gordon (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Granger
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Graves
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Grayson
Blackburn	Crowley	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Blunt	Culberson	Griffith
Boccieri	Cummings	Grijalva
Boehner	Dahlkemper	Guthrie
Bonner	Davis (AL)	Gutierrez
Bono Mack	Davis (CA)	Hall (NY)
Boozman	Davis (IL)	Hall (TX)
Boren	Davis (KY)	Halvorson
Boswell	Davis (TN)	Hare
Boucher	Deal (GA)	Harman
Boustany	DeFazio	Harper
Boyd	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Heinrich
Braley (IA)	Dent	Heller
Bright	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hensarling
Brown (GA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herger
Brown (SC)	Dicks	Herseth Sandlin
Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Higgins
Brown-Waite,	Doggett	Hill
Ginny	Donnelly (IN)	Himes
Buchanan	Doyle	Hinche
Burgess	Dreier	Hinojosa
Burton (IN)	Drie	Hirono
Butterfield	Duncan	Hodes
Buyer	Edwards (MD)	Hoekstra
Calvert	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Camp	Ehlers	Holt
Campbell	Ellison	Honda
Cantor	Ellsworth	Hoyer
Cao	Emerson	Hunter

Inglis	McMorris	Sarbanes
Inslee	Rodgers	Scalise
Israel	McNerney	Schakowsky
Issa	Meek (FL)	Schauer
Jackson (IL)	Meeks (NY)	Schiff
Jackson-Lee	Melancon	Schmidt
(TX)	Mica	Schock
Jenkins	Michaud	Schrader
Johnson (GA)	Miller (FL)	Schwartz
Johnson (IL)	Miller (MI)	Scott (GA)
Johnson, E. B.	Miller (NC)	Scott (VA)
Johnson, Sam	Miller, George	Sensenbrenner
Jones	Minnick	Serrano
Jordan (OH)	Mitchell	Sessions
Kagen	Mollohan	Sestak
Kanjorski	Moore (KS)	Shadegg
Kaptur	Moore (WI)	Shea-Porter
Kennedy	Moran (KS)	Sherman
Kildee	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
Kilpatrick (MI)	Murphy (CT)	Shuler
Kilroy	Murphy, Patrick	Shuster
Kind	Murphy, Tim	Simpson
King (IA)	Murtha	Sires
King (NY)	Myrick	Skelton
Kingston	Nadler (NY)	Slaughter
Kirk	Napolitano	Smith (NE)
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Neal (MA)	Smith (NJ)
Kissell	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Klein (FL)	Nunes	Smith (WA)
Kline (MN)	Nye	Snyder
Kosmas	Oberstar	Souder
Kratovil	Obey	Space
Kucinich	Olson	Speier
Lamborn	Oliver	Spratt
Lance	Ortiz	Stark
Langevin	Pallone	Stearns
Larsen (WA)	Pascarella	Stupak
Larson (CT)	Pastor (AZ)	Sullivan
Latham	Paul	Sutton
LaTourette	Paulsen	Tanner
Latta	Payne	Tauscher
Lee (CA)	Pence	Taylor
Lee (NY)	Perlmutter	Teague
Levin	Perriello	Terry
Lewis (CA)	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Lewis (GA)	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Linder	Petri	Thompson (PA)
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Pitts	Tiahrt
Loeb	Platts	Tiberi
Lofgren, Zoe	Poe (TX)	Tierney
Lowe	Polis (CO)	Titus
Lucas	Pomeroy	Tonko
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Towns
Lujan	Price (GA)	Tsongas
Lummis	Price (NC)	Turner
Lungren, Daniel	Radanovich	Upton
E.	Rahall	Van Hollen
Lynch	Rangel	Velázquez
Mack	Rehberg	Visclosky
Maffei	Reichert	Walden
Maloney	Reyes	Walz
Manzullo	Richardson	Wamp
Marchant	Rodriguez	Wasserman
Markey (CO)	Roe (TN)	Schultz
Markey (MA)	Rogers (AL)	Waters
Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Watson
Massa	Rogers (MI)	Watt
Matheson	Rohrabacher	Waxman
Matsui	Rooney	Weiner
McCarthy (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Welch
McCarthy (NY)	Roskam	Westmoreland
McCaul	Ross	Wexler
McClintock	Rothman (NJ)	Whitfield
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (OH)
McCotter	Royce	Wilson (SC)
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Wittman
McGovern	Rush	Wolf
McHenry	Ryan (OH)	Woolsey
McHugh	Ryan (WI)	Wu
McIntyre	Salazar	Yarmuth
McKeon	Sánchez, Linda	Young (AK)
McMahon	T.	Young (FL)
	Sánchez, Loretta	

NOT VOTING—4

Abercrombie Miller, Gary  
Cooper Putnam

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1418

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### R. JESS BROWN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUMENAUER). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 842, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 842.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—424

Ackerman	Carney	Fortenberry
Aderholt	Carson (IN)	Poster
Adler (NJ)	Carter	Fox
Akin	Cassidy	Frank (MA)
Alexander	Castle	Franks (AZ)
Altmire	Castor (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Andrews	Chaffetz	Fudge
Arcuri	Chandler	Gallely
Austria	Childers	Garrett (NJ)
Baca	Clarke	Gerlach
Bachmann	Clay	Giffords
Bachus	Cleaver	Gingrey (GA)
Baird	Clyburn	Gonzalez
Baldwin	Coble	Goodlatte
Barrett (SC)	Coffman (CO)	Gordon (TN)
Barrow	Cohen	Granger
Bartlett	Cole	Graves
Barton (TX)	Conaway	Grayson
Bean	Connolly (VA)	Green, Al
Becerra	Conyers	Green, Gene
Berkley	Berkley	Griffith
Berman	Berman	Grijalva
Berry	Berry	Guthrie
Biggert	Biggert	Gutierrez
Billray	Billray	Hall (NY)
Billirakis	Billirakis	Hall (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Halvorson
Bishop (NY)	Bishop (NY)	Hare
Bishop (UT)	Bishop (UT)	Harman
Blackburn	Blackburn	Harper
Blumenauer	Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)
Blunt	Blunt	Hastings (WA)
Boccieri	Boccieri	Heinrich
Boehner	Boehner	Heller
Bonner	Bonner	Hensarling
Bono Mack	Bono Mack	Herger
Boozman	Boozman	Herseth Sandlin
Boren	Boren	Higgins
Boswell	Boswell	Hill
Boucher	Boucher	Himes
Boustany	Boustany	Hinche
Boyd	Boyd	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Brady (PA)	Hirono
Brady (TX)	Brady (TX)	Hodes
Braley (IA)	Braley (IA)	Hoekstra
Bright	Bright	Holden
Brown (GA)	Brown (GA)	Holt
Brown (SC)	Brown (SC)	Honda
Brown, Corrine	Brown, Corrine	Hoyer
Brown-Waite,	Brown-Waite,	Hunter
Ginny	Ginny	Inglis
Buchanan	Buchanan	Inslee
Burgess	Burgess	Israel
Burton (IN)	Burton (IN)	Issa
Butterfield	Butterfield	Jackson (IL)
Buyer	Buyer	Jackson-Lee
Calvert	Calvert	(TX)
Camp	Camp	Jenkins
Campbell	Campbell	Johnson (GA)
Cantor	Cantor	Johnson (IL)
Cao	Cao	Johnson, E. B.
Capito	Capito	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Capps	Jones
Capuano	Capuano	Jordan (OH)
Cardoza	Cardoza	Kagen
Carnahan	Carnahan	Kanjorski

Kaptur	Miller, George	Schrader
Kennedy	Minnick	Schwartz
Kildee	Mitchell	Scott (GA)
Kilpatrick (MI)	Mollohan	Scott (VA)
Kilroy	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Kind	Moore (WI)	Serrano
King (IA)	Moran (KS)	Sessions
King (NY)	Moran (VA)	Sestak
Kingston	Murphy (CT)	Shadegg
Kirk	Murphy, Patrick	Shea-Porter
Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Murphy, Tim	Sherman
Kissell	Murtha	Shimkus
Klein (FL)	Myrick	Shuler
Kline (MN)	Nadler (NY)	Shuster
Kosmas	Napolitano	Simpson
Kratovil	Neal (MA)	Sires
Kucinich	Neugebauer	Skelton
Lamborn	Nunes	Slaughter
Lance	Nye	Smith (NE)
Langevin	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Larsen (WA)	Olson	Smith (TX)
Larson (CT)	Olver	Smith (WA)
Latham	Ortiz	Snyder
LaTourette	Pallone	Souder
Latta	Pascarell	Space
Lee (CA)	Pastor (AZ)	Speier
Lee (NY)	Paul	Spratt
Levin	Paulsen	Stark
Lewis (CA)	Payne	Stearns
Lewis (GA)	Pence	Stupak
Linder	Perlmutter	Sullivan
Lipinski	Perriello	Sutton
LoBiondo	Peters	Tanner
Loeback	Peterson	Tauscher
Lofgren, Zoe	Petri	Taylor
Lowe	Pingree (ME)	Teague
Lucas	Pitts	Terry
Luetkemeyer	Platts	Thompson (CA)
Lujan	Poe (TX)	Thompson (MS)
Lummis	Polis (CO)	Thompson (PA)
Lungren, Daniel	Pomeroy	Thornberry
E.	Posey	Tiahrt
Lynch	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Mack	Price (NC)	Tierney
Maffei	Radanovich	Titus
Maloney	Rahall	Tonko
Manzullo	Rangel	Towns
Marchant	Rehberg	Tsongas
Markey (CO)	Reichert	Turner
Markey (MA)	Reyes	Upton
Marshall	Richardson	Van Hollen
Massa	Rodriguez	Velázquez
Matheson	Roe (TN)	Visclosky
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Walden
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)	Walz
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Wamp
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Wasserman
McClintock	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
McCollum	Roskam	Waters
McCotter	Ross	Watson
McDermott	Rothman (NJ)	Watt
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McHenry	Royce	Weiner
McHugh	Ruppersberger	Welch
McIntyre	Rush	Westmoreland
McKeon	Ryan (OH)	Wexler
McMahon	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
McMorris	Salazar	Wilson (OH)
Rodgers	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (SC)
McNerney	T.	Wittman
Meek (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
Meeks (NY)	Sarbanes	Woolsey
Melancon	Scalise	Wu
Mica	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Michaud	Schauer	Young (AK)
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Young (FL)
Miller (MI)	Schmidt	
Miller (NC)	Schock	

## NOT VOTING—7

Abercrombie	Miller, Gary	Rooney
Cooper	Oberstar	
Gohmert	Putnam	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1425

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FUDGE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 20, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702, I hereby reappoint as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress the following person: Mr. Bernard Forrester, Houston, Texas.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,  
Clerk.

## HELP IS ON THE WAY

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, we have seen the unemployment numbers continue to climb in our Nation. We're watching the Dow tremble. But I think it is important that we understand help is on the way, that the American people are watching a process in this body and in the other body that will generate not earmarks but dollars for communities. For many people think that earmarks are moneys that we grab and put in our pocket. It is only the direction given to money already there to help the people in your community: rural Appalachia, Iowa.

So in addition to this appropriations bill that is now in the other body, this Congress voted against their salary increase. And for those who don't understand that, as the debate is going on in the other body, we have already done it. We have already put forward a bill that speaks to the people's needs and makes sure that our salary increase is not there. Our leadership demanded that.

So I ask the other body to get on with their work and vote for the bill.

□ 1430

## GREEN HARD HATS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, someday we may be using alternative energy, and we must work to that end. But right now we need clean crude oil for energy.

We should drill safely off our own shores because that will make us energy independent. It will increase jobs. Some of those offshore jobs pay up to \$100,000 a year. The leases that oil companies pay for are expensive, and that lease revenue comes to the U.S. Treasury.

Madam Speaker, we are also going to need crude oil in the future for other

things, and here is why. Last week on one of the coldest days in D.C. during 8 inches of snow, the global warming folks were in town. They were all wearing green hard hats, and I asked one did she know what that hard hat was made out of, and she told me plastic. Well, I asked her where did the plastic come from, and she said, "Well, it's plastic. It's made out of plastic."

Madam Speaker, plastic is not an element or mineral. That plastic helmet and much of what we use daily is a derivative of crude oil. We are always going to need crude oil for the thousands of products that come from it.

We need to take care of America and drill safely off our shores and keep jobs and revenue in America instead of sending it to the Middle East.

And that's just the way it is.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## ONE TEAM—ONE FIGHT—ONE NAME: REDESIGNATING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AS THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, earlier this year I introduced H.R. 24, legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

For the past 7 years, the language of this bill has been part of the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act. Last year, 152 Members of the House cosponsored the bill to support this change. This session, the bill has gained 58 cosponsors so far. I hope many of the new Members of the House will consider supporting H.R. 24.

This year, I am grateful to have the support of Senator PAT ROBERTS, a former Marine, who recently introduced a companion bill in the Senate, S. 504. I hope that the Senate will support the House position and maybe this will be the year that Congress sends legislation to the President to bring proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Changing the name of the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is a symbolic gesture, but is important to the team. I would like to read a statement



by one supporter of this change, the Honorable Wade Sanders, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs from 1993-1998:

"As a combat veteran and a former Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic, and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that: a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership."

Madam Speaker, the Marines who are fighting today deserve this recognition. Before I close, I would like to point out there are many, many justifications for renaming the department Navy and Marine Corps. We all know that the Navy and Marine Corps are one fighting team, and that is the history of both the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, on this poster is a condolence letter from the Department of the Navy. This was sent to the wife of a Marine who was killed in Iraq for this country.

Madam Speaker, on the letter sent by the Secretary of the Navy, it says "The Secretary of the Navy." Then the first sentence, it says, "On behalf of the Department of the Navy, please accept our very sincere condolences."

Well, Madam Speaker, that is very kind of the Secretary of the Navy, and I am sure that the Marine family that gave a loved one who died for this country during warfare appreciates that letter, but I respectfully say that even more important to the Marine family who lost a loved one would be that if the letter had said, "The Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps," with the flag of the Navy and the flag of the Marine Corps, and then it further stated, "Dear Marine Corps Family: On behalf of the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, please accept my sincere condolences."

Madam Speaker, before I close, I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base and Cherry Point Air Station in my district, and also Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. Other parts of the Armed Forces have the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force. Now we need to have a Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. It's only right to the Marine Corps that they be equally represented and equally respected.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask God to please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and may God continue to bless America.

#### END OCCUPATION OF IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, today I rise to deliver my 300th speech on the floor of the House, speeches demanding an end to the occupation of Iraq.

I take no pleasure in marking this milestone, except that in this great de-

mocracy we have it is possible for one Member of the House to stand here and express her opinions. But instead of pleasure, it deeply saddens me, for it reminds me just how long the Iraq occupation has been dragging on.

America's invasion and occupation of Iraq began 6 years ago this month. On March 21, 2003, the previous administration gave us "Shock and Awe." There were big explosions on our TV sets, but innocent people were being killed that night in Baghdad. And for the next 6 years, the body count continued to rise as Iraq became a hell on Earth.

Today conditions on the ground have improved, but the occupation goes on. Over 140,000 American troops remain in harm's way. Over 100,000 military contractors continue to roam the streets of Iraq, unaccountable to anyone but themselves. Military families continue to suffer here at home and tens of thousands of veterans suffer from injuries that will last a lifetime.

I voted against authorizing the use of force in Iraq, and I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a resolution calling for the withdrawal of our troops. For 6 years I have made the case that the occupation makes no sense.

On February 2, 2005, I said on the floor of the House "The sad irony is that after our Nation was attacked on 9/11 by al Qaeda, (our) response was to bomb and kill civilians in one of the few countries in the Middle East that was inhospitable to al Qaeda."

I also pointed out that the occupation wasn't making America any safer. On March 19, 2007, I said, "The rate of fatal terror attacks worldwide was increased by a factor of seven since the Iraq war began."

And I noted that the occupation was bleeding our Treasury dry and threatening our economy. On October 25, 2007, I said, "It's incredible to me that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who lecture us daily about fiscal constraints, (do) not make a peep about the fiscal catastrophe" of Iraq.

I also raised my voice over and over again to decry the other tragic consequences of the occupation, which included the tragic loss of over 100,000 American and Iraqi lives, the refugee crisis, the torture at Abu Ghraib and elsewhere, the shabby treatment of our veterans at Walter Reed, the "Mission Accomplished" and weapons of mass destruction fiascos, the manipulation of intelligence to create a false cause for war, the cynical use of the 9/11 tragedy to justify military action against Iraq that the Bush administration had been planning all along, the scandal of sending our troops into battle without proper body armor and the terrible damage to our Nation's moral standing and reputation in the world.

I also spoke about the tremendous bravery and the skill of our troops and the amazing courage of the mothers of section 60 at Arlington National Cemetery, and I rose time and time again to

offer a real alternative to the occupation, a smart security plan, a plan that would defeat terrorism without the need to wage immoral and unnecessary wars.

Most recently, I rose to declare that the current plan to leave 50,000 residual troops after August 2010 in Iraq is unacceptable. I believe the best approach now is to withdraw all our troops by August 2010 and coordinate their removal with reconciliation and reconstruction efforts, efforts to promote the unification of the Iraqi people.

Madam Speaker, the occupation of Iraq violates America's core values of peace, freedom and human rights. I will continue to raise my voice on the floor of the House for these values until we bring all our troops home to their families and the peace and sovereignty of Iraq is restored.

I will also continue to raise my voice on this floor for a new and better foreign policy based on diplomacy and peaceful international cooperation.

I shall soon deliver speech number 301.

#### CUT GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, the Washington Post the other day commented about the President's support of the \$410 billion omnibus spending bill that's crawling through the Senate, and they said that it borders on the irresponsible for the administration to try to blame this on last year's administration because they are the ones that are going to sign the bill into law and spend the money.

In another newspaper here in Washington D.C., the Washington Examiner, they wrote "In quick succession, (President) Obama rolled out a \$2 trillion financial services bailout, \$2 trillion, a \$788 billion stimulus package, the \$13.4 billion preliminary bailout for automakers, a \$410 billion spending plan to cover the rest of the current fiscal year, a proposed \$275 billion foreclosure rescue plan, and a \$3.5 trillion budget that includes a \$634 billion fund for health care."

People in America, their eyes glaze over when they hear this. Trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars that we don't have are going to be spent for all of these programs.

And so people say, well, how are you going to solve the economic problems facing this country if you don't spend that money? If we spend the money, we are not going to solve the problems. The economic conditions will continue to go in the wrong direction, but we will be loading on the backs of our kids and grandkids and future generations, higher inflation and higher taxes and a quality of life that won't be anything like what we have today.

The key to solving these problems is to cut government spending, and to cut



taxes for every American so they have more disposable income, and to cut taxes on capital gains so people will take stocks, bonds and property they have and sell it and reinvest it somewhere else, thus creating money for investment in business and industry so they can create jobs and cut business taxes across the board.

□ 1445

If we did those three things, we would have an immediate movement toward improvement in our economy, and we wouldn't be doing it by loading trillions and trillions of dollars on the backs of our kids and grandkids.

This chart here shows what's happened in the last several years as far as the growth in the money supply. It was pretty consistent up until the year 2000, and now it's going straight up. That means to every single American that the cost of living is going to go up because there's more money in circulation, fewer goods and services, and the cost of everything is going to rise because of the inflation that's created by printing all this money.

John F. Kennedy said that the way to solve these problems—back in the early sixties, a Democrat—that it was to cut taxes. Here's exactly what he said. "Our true choice is not between tax reduction, on the one hand, and the avoidance of large Federal deficits on the other. It is increasingly clear that no matter what party is in power, so long as our national security needs keep rising, an economy hampered by restricted tax rates will never produce enough revenues to balance our budget, just as it will never produce enough jobs or enough profits. In short, it is a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high today, and tax revenues are too low, and the soundest ways to raise the revenues in the long run is to cut taxes now."

The best way to raise revenues for the Treasury is to cut taxes. The best way to stimulate economic growth is to cut taxes. Yet, this administration is going to be raising taxes in one way or another on every single family in this country, either through the tax that is going to be on energy or the taxes they are going to levy on the upper income people. But there's going to be taxes levied on every single American, and that is the wrong way to stimulate economic growth.

What they are doing is they are throwing money at this problem, saying that that will solve the problem. It has never worked in the past. It will not work now.

Back in the 1970s, under Jimmy Carter, this was tried. And we ended up with double-digit inflation—14 percent inflation, 12 percent unemployment—and they ended up raising interest rates to 21.5 percent to stop the runaway inflation that was killing the economy of the United States, and they put us into another real bad recession. It wasn't until Reagan came in in 1980 and cut taxes across the board that

we ended up with the longest period of economic recovery in the United States history.

History shows that cutting taxes in times of economic stress is the way to work our way out of this situation. And throwing money, trillions and trillions and trillions of dollars, and move us toward a socialistic economy, is not the solution.

I hope my colleagues will look into history. Look at what John F. Kennedy, what Ronald Reagan, and others said about this, because it's extremely important that we profit from history.

#### RON BROWN FEDERAL BUILDING NAMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. I rise to celebrate the life of former Secretary of Commerce Ron H. Brown, who was the first African American to hold that position, and the first African American to serve as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I want to thank Chairman RANGEL for bringing this resolution to the floor, designating the Federal building located at the United Nations Plaza in New York City as the "Ron H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building."

At the time of his death in 1996, Mr. Brown was a figure of global importance and an advocate for American businesses at home and abroad. Through his example, Ron was a pioneer for many African Americans, and a role model, and was respected for his leadership, intelligence, and public service.

Born in Washington, DC, on August 1, 1941, and raised in Harlem, New York, he spent most of his life working for the people of New York and the citizens of the United States. As Secretary, he circled the globe spreading goodwill with his enthusiasm.

I remember traveling with Ron once to Africa as he was cultivating opportunities and markets for American products. It was on one of these trade missions that he died in a plane crash in war-torn Eastern Europe on April 3, 1996.

Ron left behind a wife, Alma, two devoted children, Michael and Tracey, and a record of commitment to the job he loved. Since his death, Ron has been recognized with many awards and scholarships, including the Ron Brown Award for Corporate Leadership and Responsibility, established by President William J. Clinton; the annual Ron H. Brown American Innovator Award, established by the U.S. Department of Commerce; and the largest ship in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's fleet named in honor of his public service, the *Ronald H. Brown*.

Please join me today in celebrating the life and service of one great Amer-

ican statesperson and pioneer, Mr. Ron H. Brown.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### EARMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. I would like to address the subject of earmarks today. I think there's a lot of misunderstanding here among the Members as to exactly what it means to vote against an earmark. It's very popular today to condemn earmarks, and even hold up legislation because of this.

The truth is that if you removed all the earmarks from the budget, you would remove 1 percent of the budget. So there's not a lot of savings. But, even if you voted against all the earmarks actually, you don't even save the 1 percent because you don't save any money.

What is done is, those earmarks are removed, and some of them are very wasteful and unnecessary, but that money then goes to the executive branch. So, in many ways, what we are doing here in the Congress is reneging on our responsibilities, because it is the responsibility of the Congress to earmark. That is our job. We are supposed to tell the people how we are spending the money, not to just deliver it in a lump sum to the executive branch and let them deal with it, and then it's dealt with behind the scenes.

Actually, if you voted against all the earmarks, there would be less transparency. Earmarks really allow transparency, and we know exactly where the money is being spent.

The big issue is the spending. If you don't like the spending, vote against the bill. But the principle of earmarking is something that we have to think about, because we are just further undermining the responsibilities that we have here in the Congress.

If we want to get things under control, it won't be because we vote against an earmark and make a big deal of attacking earmarks because it doesn't address the subject. In reality, what we need are more earmarks.

Just think of the \$350 billion that we recently appropriated and gave to the Treasury Department. Now everybody's running around and saying, Well, we don't know where the money went. We just gave it to them in a lump sum. We should have earmarked everything. It should have been designated where the money is going.

So, instead of too many earmarks, we don't have enough earmarks. Transparency is the only way we can get to

the bottom of this. And if you make everything earmarked, it would be much better.

The definition of an earmark is very, very confusing. If you would vote to support the embassy, which came up to nearly \$1 billion in Baghdad, that is not called an earmark. But if you have an earmark for a highway or a building here in the United States, that is called an earmark. If you vote for a weapons system, it would support and help a certain district, and that's not considered an earmark.

When people are yelling and screaming about getting rid of earmarks, they're not talking about getting rid of weapons systems or building buildings and bridges and highways in foreign countries. They are only talking about when it's designated that certain money would be spent a certain way in this country.

Ultimately, where we really need some supervision and some earmarks are the trillions of dollars spent by the Federal Reserve. They get to create their money out of thin air, and spend it. They have no responsibility to tell us anything. Under the law, they are excluded from telling us where and what they do.

So, we neglect telling the Treasury how to spend TARP money, and then we complain about how they do it. But just think literally; the Treasury is miniscule compared to what the Federal Reserve does.

The Treasury gets hundreds of billions, which is huge, of course, and then we neglect to talk about the Federal Reserve, where they are creating money out of thin air, and supporting all their friends and taking care of certain banks and certain corporations. This, to me, has to be addressed.

I have introduced a bill, it's called H.R. 1207, and this would remove the restriction on us to find out what the Federal Reserve is doing. Today, the Federal Reserve under the law is not required to tell us anything. So all my bill does is remove this restriction and say, Look, Federal Reserve, you have a lot of power. You have too much power. You're spending a lot of money. You're taking care of people that we have no idea what you're doing. We, in the Congress, have a responsibility to know exactly what you're doing.

This bill, H.R. 1207, will allow us for once and for all to have some supervision of the Federal Reserve. They are exempt from telling us anything, and they have stiffed us already. There have been lawsuits filed over the Freedom of Information Act. Believe me, they are not going to work, because the law protects the Federal Reserve.

The Constitution doesn't protect the Federal Reserve. The Constitution protects the people to know exactly what is going on. We should enforce the Constitution. We should not enforce these laws that protect a secret bank that gets to create this money out of thin air.

So, the sooner we in the Congress wake up to our responsibilities, under-

stand what earmarks are all about, and understand why we need a lot more earmarks, then we will come to our senses, because we might then have a more sensible monetary and banking system, the system that has brought us to this calamity. So, the sooner we realize that, I think it would be better for the taxpayer.

#### CONGRATULATING CONGRESSWOMAN WOOLSEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to join my distinguished colleague, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, and recognize her for her 300th Special Order, or 5-minute speech, on the ongoing war and the occupation in Iraq. I also stand here calling yet, again, for an end, and I mean an end, to this unjust war, and for the return of our troops and military contractors from Iraq.

Congresswoman WOOLSEY, let me just commend you for being such an unparalleled leader and a guiding light in Congress for peace, for smart security, and for justice. Congresswoman WOOLSEY, if you may remember, offered the first resolution calling for the withdrawal of our young men and women and the redeployment and bringing them home, and that was years ago.

Today, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, thanks to your leadership, I think we are closer to that first resolution, where you stepped out on faith but knew that that was the right thing to do. I think we are closer to that day.

Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, founder of the Out of Iraq Caucus, and Congresswoman WOOLSEY and myself cofounded the Out of Iraq Caucus in order to really amplify this important message and the call to action to end this war of choice. And that is what it is.

But Congresswoman WOOLSEY has been the one who's been down here representing us and representing the voices of peace in the entire country each and every day to make sure that she shone light on the untold hazards and costs of the United States military presence in Iraq.

As cochair of the Progressive Caucus, Congresswoman WOOLSEY has worked tirelessly to bring attention to these vital issues of global peace and national security. And so, today, 300 times, this is really an amazing milestone.

So, I am very, very pleased to be able to be with you today, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, and also just to say I am proud that you're my colleague and sister next to my district from the north.

It's really, though, with a heavy heart that I note next week that our country will enter into the seventh year of this unnecessary and immoral war in Iraq. Six years of unnecessary bloodshed in Iraq. We have wasted too

much American treasure, drained too much and too many of our American resources and, most importantly, Madam Speaker, we have, unfortunately, claimed too many American lives.

As of February 25, 2009, according to the Defense Department, 4,252 brave servicemen and women have given their lives, and more than 30,000 United States troops have been injured. This war has already cost the American people more than \$650 billion—this is \$10 billion a month—as the economy spirals further and further into crisis.

□ 1500

The costs to the people of Iraq also have been far greater. Tens of thousands of Iraqi men, women, and children have been killed. More than a million Iraqis have fled their homes and live as refugees. Hundreds of thousands have been internally displaced.

As we have watched our Federal resources go toward the continuation of violence and strife in Iraq, Congresswoman WOOLSEY has reminded us over and over and over again, 300 times now, that these are dollars that are not coming back into our communities or toward vital programs to help our neighbors most in need. We have committed more than a half trillion dollars to an occupation that, yes, has undermined our standing and credibility in the world, the enormous costs of which will no doubt be exacted on the physical and economic security of future generations. Of course we know the simple truth, that no unjust war ever produced a just and lasting peace. We look forward to working with our new administration to continue our efforts to bring our troops and military contractors home.

I have to say again to Congresswoman WOOLSEY, thank you for your unwavering leadership and commitment. I am truly proud to serve with you in this body. When this unfortunate chapter in American history is written, especially the foreign policy chapter, your consistency and your courage and your resolve before this body will be long remembered. Moreover, your Special Orders should be acknowledged for their effort in rallying the American people to demand an end to this war and to finally bring our troops home.

So this is a milestone today. Hopefully we won't have too many more 300 times of your sounding the alarm, and that we can bring our young men and women home and begin to really move forward in seeking global peace and security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EARMARKS AND NO-BID  
CONTRACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, when most people think about earmarks, they think of the silly earmarks that we hear about like the one in the omnibus spending bill that will pass the Senate today, \$1.7 million to combat swine odor in Iowa. And there are a lot of earmarks like that. Or one for the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, or one for a hippie memorial. That is typically what is on people's minds when they think of earmarks. But today there is a different type of earmark, and it is not your grandfather's earmark. It is something that has really come about in the last several years or really been perfected in the last several years. These earmarks are no-bid contracts to private companies.

Now, when the Federal Government spends money, there are stipulations in how they spend that money. It is very difficult for a Federal agency to award a no-bid contract. If they do, they have to jump through a lot of hoops. There has to be a national security exemption. There have to be other exemptions. It is difficult to do, and gratefully so.

President Obama announced the other day that he is going to try to make sure that there are no more no-bid contracts from Federal agencies. And that is a great move. But what hasn't been talked about are the no-bid earmarks, no-bid contracts that are in the form of earmarks that come from Congress that is congressionally directed no-bid contracts. And what it leads to is what I like to call circular fundraising, and this is what has been the subject of a few of the privileged resolutions that have been offered here in the House in the last couple of days.

What happens is you have money here that Congress has from the U.S. taxpayer. Earmark spending which will be some \$8 billion to \$10 billion this year, goes this way. It goes to the earmark recipient. Say it is a defense contractor. And in this case if a defense contractor is getting a no-bid contract to make some widget for the Navy or for the Army or something else, or to make a shirt or a pair of gloves for our Armed Forces, they will get that contract, a no-bid contract, and then what you will see is money will come right back to the Member of Congress who secured that earmark in the form of a campaign contribution. That is represented by the line that goes around there. And in some cases, in most cases now, those who secure the earmark for a no-bid contract receive campaign contributions from those who they got no-bid contract for.

Oftentimes the earmark recipient will hire a lobbying firm, and that lobbying firm will also make contributions to the Member. And then sometimes the lobbying firm will also have

a PAC, and that PAC will make contributions to the Member. So, in some cases, a Member of Congress will get what could be called the trifecta: They will get regular contributions from the earmark recipient, money from the lobbying firm, and also money from the lobbying firm's PAC.

For one defense contract, say, for a few million dollars, a no-bid contract, sometimes the Member of Congress can receive as much as \$50,000 to \$100,000 for one earmark, for what appears to be for one earmark. By the time the earmark recipient and the lobbying firm and the lobbying firm's PAC contribute to the Member, that is a lot of money that makes it back into the Member of Congress' hands. So what happens? It is easier then to earmark more spending the next year and to do more no-bid contracts.

This is the essence of the privileged resolution that was offered. There is a lobbying firm called PMA that has been raided by the FBI in recent weeks, or we learned of it in recent weeks. That lobbying firm contributed millions and millions of dollars to Members of Congress who had secured earmarks for the client of this lobbying firm. The lobbying firm's PAC had contributed millions and millions of dollars as well to those Members of Congress who secured earmark spending.

Madam Speaker, it simply isn't right for Members of Congress to get a no-bid contract for anyone, let alone those who turn around and contribute money back to that Member. It simply doesn't look right. There may not be a quid pro quo here, but it should not be allowed by the House to happen. The House should set a higher standard. We are charged with upholding the dignity and decorum of the House. And when you have circular fundraising like this happening and investigations swirling around, we simply can't allow this to continue, Madam Speaker.

I hope that the next time a privileged resolution is up that we will all vote to carry it to the Ethics Committee.

COMMEMORATING THE TENTH AN-  
NIVERSARY OF HUNGARY'S AC-  
CESSION TO NATO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 10th anniversary of Hungary's accession to NATO. Hungary is the first former Soviet nation, followed soon thereafter by Poland and then the Czech Republic, to join NATO. I stand here today to express gratitude for that historical moment and being given the opportunity to witness it and to recognize Hungary's pioneering commitment to solidarity, freedom, and security.

Despite years of Soviet rule, Hungary maintained a posture that looked both east and west. She became one of the first countries to institute meaningful

political and economic reform after the fall of the Berlin Wall. And during the Cold War, Hungary struggled mightily not to let the door to her people close completely.

The country's exceptional acumen also boasts an impressive mathematical and scientific legacy that includes 13 Nobel Prizes, inventing the BASIC programming language, and even creating Rubik's cube. This is a nation of major measure.

When Hungary joined NATO on March 12, 1999, an enduring relationship was cemented between Hungary, Europe, and the United States. This partnership means more than a military alliance. It marked a rebirth of freedom with an end to oppression by the then Soviet Union. This historic achievement was celebrated from Budapest to Ohio, which boasts the largest Hungarian American population in our country according to the last census. This new era was marked importantly by our congressional district of Toledo that adopted two cities in Hungary, Szeged and its county, Csongrad County.

Hundreds of citizens since 1999 have been involved in cultural, educational, and political exchanges of extraordinary impact. And through the lifelong efforts of major leaders in our community, including now deceased Monsignor Martin Hernady, Ohio Representative Peter Ujvagi, the Hungarian Club of Toledo and its leader Mr. Andy Raikay, Holy Rosary, Calvin United and St. Stephen's Churches, Dr. Elizabeth Balint and Mr. Al Baldwin of the Great Lakes Consortium for International Training and Development, along with the University of Toledo, Bowling Green State University and Lords College, all are working together to build freedom forward.

Because of the new opportunities presented by NATO, the United States and Hungary were able to enrich our friendship. Our Ohio National Guard began an early partnership with the Republic of Hungary for the express purpose of demonstrating through the example of the citizen soldier the proper role of the military in a democratic society. Hungary's rich history, as well as its embrace of a new post-Soviet era governance, sets a strong example for other countries in the region that are still grappling with a meaningful identity as newly independent states. By working with our allies, America continues to nurture democracy and advance political freedoms in Eastern Europe and around the world.

An independent film that I was able to view last year, called Torn From the Flag, which has won all kinds of international awards, traces the history of Hungary from World War II through its current independence. I commend this film to all of our citizenry.

Tonight, I rise to pay tribute to Hungary, our great sister nation in liberty's cause. What a great joy it has been to get to know her people and her traditions in greater measure. And I

thank the people of my community who truly have been, each and every one of them, ambassadors of freedom from the United States to our great sister state of Hungary.

#### AUTO INDUSTRY FACTS AND FIGURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise today.

Madam Speaker, over the course of the last 30 years, pockets of our country have been facing some very difficult times. And I have the honor of representing an area in Northeast Ohio, from Akron over to Youngstown. This is an area that was built on steel and rubber and auto and manufacturing. And I want to make one comment, as I rise to talk a little bit about the auto industry, about my friend, the gentleman from Arizona, who was commenting about earmarks and investments that Members of Congress are constitutionally required to make and spend money on behalf of the people of this country.

In areas like mine who, for 30 or 40 years, were booming, had the highest per capita income in the country when the steel mills were going, we were taking our tax dollars and we were sending that money to Washington, D.C.; Washington, D.C. was sending that money to help build the West, to help build up States like Arizona, and to implement water projects and dam projects to take the Colorado River into the desert.

These congressional districts in Arizona and New Mexico, they didn't just pop up. There was a significant Federal investment to say that we want to develop the West. And now, Members of Congress who are looking for the opportunity to rebuild their community, to take specific projects and specific money and invest it in Youngstown State University, Akron University for Polymers, Youngstown State for Defense Center of Excellence, Youngstown State for Metrology and Materials Science Development, these are investments that we need to make to rehabilitate some old industrial areas to get them on the cutting edge, and I think our obligation is to do that. But in our area, what has transpired just over the last few months has been significant. And I will give you one example.

Earlier last year, in the summertime, General Motors at a local Lordstown plant said that they were going to put on a third shift. We had the governor in; there were state tax incentives, \$350 million. And eventually, because of the credit crisis and globalization and 30 years of bad trade agreements, the third shift was pulled. Then the second shift was pulled. And now we have a fraction of the workers that we used to have there.

But the minute GM announced that they were going to lay off 900 workers, a couple days later the seat manufacturer laid off a few hundred; a couple days later the logistics company laid off a couple hundred workers; Delphi laid off. And on and on and on the ripple effect goes throughout the community, to the point where Trumbull County's unemployment rate last year, Madam Speaker, was 7 percent.

□ 1515

It is to the point where Trumbull County's unemployment rate last year, Madam Speaker, was 7 percent. Today it is 14 percent. It doubled in a year.

And the point of my rising here today is to say to anyone who will listen and to the powers that be in Washington, D.C., that we need a manufacturing policy in the United States of America. We can look at the Dutch, the Spanish and the Brits. When 20 to 25 percent of their gross domestic product became finance, where people are just shuffling money around, where it is a Ponzi scheme and Wall Street is making a lot of money, and wages don't ever go up, then eventually you get to where we are today. And that is a collapse of the financial system.

We have a system now that is set up, Madam Speaker, that if an average family makes some mistakes, they are on their own. We cut them loose. But if the financial markets make a major mistake and do illegal and unethical acts, that they have the system so rigged that the whole thing collapses. And so everyone has to jump in to save it.

And so as we move over the course of the next few weeks and next few months, we need to recognize that the auto industry has a multiplier effect of five jobs for every one job in the plant, and finance has two jobs for every job in the finance industry. And we can talk about companies like Wheatland Tube, who have closed factories down in northeast Ohio and western Pennsylvania because of the tubing coming in from China. We could talk about auto. We could talk about Severstal Steel, who laid off 1,000 people. We could go on and on and on, Madam Speaker.

So let me suggest that as we talk about financial reform and universal health care, that we also add a manufacturing policy to the United States plan for the future.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF COAST GUARD PETTY OFFICER FIRST CLASS LAVELAS LUCKEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. First of all, Madam Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the words of Mr. RYAN of Ohio. He is absolutely right. And we can do better in this country with regard to the issues of making sure that we have a manufacturing base. Not

only must we have a manufacturing base, but we must have an innovation base. And in order to have that, certainly we have to build up our educational systems throughout these United States.

Madam Speaker, I come before the House today as chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation to pay a special tribute to a true American hero, Coast Guard Petty Officer First Class Lavelas Luckey. Last week, a 33-year-old woman tragically lost her life when her car was struck from behind and pushed into the path of a garbage truck as she was preparing to drop her daughter off at a nursery school in Glen Burnie, Maryland.

Petty Officer Lavelas Luckey, an electrical equipment specialist at the nearby Engineering Logistics Center's Equipment Management Division at the Coast Guard Yard in Curtis Bay, Maryland, happened to be in the area at the time. And he immediately sprung into action. According to authorities, after realizing people were still in the badly damaged vehicle, Petty Officer Luckey immediately pushed through a crowd of onlookers and pulled the 5-year-old girl from her car seat minutes before the car burst into flames. The little girl's mother was freed from the car by a police officer.

Unfortunately, the girl's mother, Christine Schoppert, was pronounced dead at the scene. Thankfully, however, the child survived the crash and was immediately taken to the Johns Hopkins Hospital with life-threatening injuries. Recent reports indicate that she is improving. My prayers, and I know the prayers of this Congress, are with the family of Christine Schoppert and her daughter as she begins to make what we hope will be a speedy and complete recovery.

I'm extremely grateful that I have a chance to thank Petty Officer First Class Lavelas Luckey for putting his own safety at great risk in saving this precious young life. After speaking to his commanding officers and fellow members of the Coast Guard, none of them were surprised by Petty Officer Luckey's actions. Petty Officer Luckey has been described as being an extremely dedicated member of the United States Coast Guard—and as a great human being. These are powerful words that should not be taken lightly. Far too often we look to the red carpets of Hollywood and our local football stadiums to find our heroes while overlooking the individuals who perform truly heroic actions in our own neighborhoods.

I take my hat off to Petty Officer First Class Lavelas Luckey for his act of bravery and applaud the entire United States Coast Guard and the rest of our armed services for their efforts to protect this country from all harm. I also extend a special salute to all of the Nation's first responders who risk their lives every day to save others.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING  
REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a)  
OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO  
CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN  
RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-35) on the resolution (H. Res. 229) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to be able to speak this afternoon to the American people about something that has been on all of their minds for the last 5 months, and that is spending, the out-of-control spending that they see occurring here in their Nation's Capital. And they are worried. They are worried, Madam Speaker, about what they are seeing.

And there is an old adage that we have heard as a precursor to a joke. Since we have been children, we have heard the adage that asks a simple question: What comes first, the chicken or the egg? And we ask that question in public policy: What comes first, spending or taxes? And clearly, spending is the precursor to taxes. And what we have seen the Obama administration and the Democrats who currently control both the House and the Senate embrace is a new initiative never seen before in the history of our country, a level of spending that is unprecedented.

Joining me now in this hour that we have to speak to the American people is one of our new freshmen. His name is Mr. JASON CHAFFETZ. And he hails from Utah's Third Congressional District. We are very excited to have him join us and to have him speak now to this body and to the American people on spending and what that means for our economy. Mr. CHAFFETZ, I yield.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentlewoman. It is a pleasure and honor to serve in the United States Congress. I'm a freshman here. I didn't create this problem, but I am here to help clean it up. I argued for a long time that the Republican spending was far too egregious, that we were spending far too much money and continued to propel ourselves into debt that was unsustainable and unacceptable in my opinion.

It is funny, though, that as I hear the Democrats argue that while there was all this out-of-control spending when the Republicans were in charge, that somehow that has changed, that somehow deficit spending has changed. It

has not. It is partly what got us into this problem.

We, on an average day, have added \$2.8 billion to our national debt since January of 2007. That doesn't count the stimulus. That doesn't count the bailout. That doesn't count any of these nearly \$2 trillion, trillion, of additional spending that we have seen this Congress all too often just quickly go off and give away.

We cannot run this government on a credit card. Our families can't do that. My family can't do that. The American people can't do that. This Federal Government has got to stop doing that. We don't have a revenue problem in this country for our Federal Government. We do have a spending problem. We have a huge spending problem.

I remember when I was in college, not too long ago, but it was a while ago, and I had my monthly stipend for the month. And at about week 3, I ran out of money. And I thought I will just call mom and dad and they will just send me the money. So I called up and talked to my mom. And she said, no, I'm sorry, you're going to have to figure it out. And my dad, whom I really didn't want to call, said, you had your allowance, you have got to learn to live within it. It is one of the most valuable lessons that I ever learned. I learned more about Top Ramen noodles than anyone in this country in that week. And it was a good thing. It was a healthy thing. It made me reprioritize what was important. And it made me think through what was a priority in my life, that I couldn't just go on the credit card and continue to spend more money.

The primary reason I ran for the United States Congress is because I care about the future and because we are on a trajectory that is unsustainable. Until we return to those core principles of fiscal discipline, limited government, accountability and a strong national defense, we will continue to suffer as a Nation. And right at the top, right at the top of that list is fiscal discipline. Because there are things, there are roles and responsibilities that our government has to execute on. And we can all point to failures. We can all point to successes. But fundamentally, the spending in this Congress, the spending that is proposed by the Obama administration, is simply unacceptable.

We cannot be all things to all people. And my concern is that the rhetoric is not matching the reality. I sat right here at in this Chamber, row 7, thrilled and honored to watch the President of the United States address the joint session of Congress. He asked in that session that we present appropriation bills free of earmarks. And yet the very next day, it hadn't even been 24 hours, the House of Representatives passed a bill with more than 8,500 earmarks. I'm proud to say I voted "no" on that. There was a presentation that said that they wanted more openness, that we wanted more transparency, that we

were going to get 5 days to review a bill online, that the American people would get to see what is in these bills, and that we as a body here in the House of Representatives would have 48 hours, 48 hours, to be able to see what is in a bill before we voted on it. It unanimously passed this body in a resolution. And yet just over 12 hours later, we got the single largest spending bill in the history of the United States. It was more than 1,000 pages. We had just over 12 hours.

That is not openness. That is not transparency. And the consequence is this out-of-control spending. It was \$1 trillion, a number so big it is not even fathomable. And now we look and we hear people say, well, 95 percent of Americans are not going to pay one dime more in taxes. That is not true. It is not true. American people, I hope you digest this, it is not true.

The so-called carbon tax, or the cap-and-trade, is a tax that will be paid by 100 percent of Americans, 100 percent of Americans. If you consume or use any form of energy, you're going to have to pay this tax. Now, I want to take care of the environment. I care about the environment. But this is simply not the time and the way to do it. And if you look at this chart here, what is sickening to me and our future is what is going to happen with our debt. Based on the President's presentation, based on the spending plan that he has put together, based on the President's budget, we are going to double, double, our national debt to \$20 trillion. Somebody has to pay that. It is the American people that are going to pay that, my kids and their grandkids. We have got to cut the size and scope of government. We cannot be all things to all people.

Somehow, some way, we have got to find a way to be disciplined enough to say, enough is enough. Let's prioritize those things that are most important that we have to do to protect and take care of the American people. But we cannot continue this out-of-control spending.

Just over 10 years ago, our Federal budget was \$1.5 trillion. Now we are over \$3 trillion on our way to \$4 trillion. And that doesn't count the bailouts, the stimulus and the others who are already beating the drum saying, we need more. No, you don't. We need to cut spending and cut back the size and scope of government, because in my opinion this government right now is spending too much, the administration is taxing too much, and this administration is absolutely borrowing too much money.

□ 1530

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Representative CHAFFETZ from Utah's Third Congressional District, and what an honor to serve with you. What an honor to know that we have freshmen who have learned the true lessons of life, that you live on Ramon noodles rather than get money from mom and

dad. That's where it all comes from. Our country is well served from having his representation.

Spending is the issue that we need to address right now. It comes down to a philosophical claim and a philosophical shift. That may not seem like much, but we are here debating ideas on the floor of the House of Representatives. And there is a big idea that we are grappling with right now: where are the answers to the problems that lie before our Nation? Where are those answers? Who is the best person to solve those problems?

What we have seen in just the last 50 days is a decided shift, a transformational shift, a groundbreaking shift from the way America has previously done business, and it says this. It says that there is a real belief that the genius of America lies in government, and that it lies in Washington, D.C., and that it lies with the Federal Government making more and more decisions over the personal areas of our lives. And that the Federal Government is far wiser with our money than the individual is with their own money, or that a private business is with their money, or a local community is with their money.

These are troubling times to be sure, but is the answer to be found in a larger government that comes about through greater levels of spending? Well, that is not what a Harvard study found back in about 2002. Researchers from Harvard made an exhaustive study, one of the largest of its kind done over a series of years. This is what they studied. They studied over 18 different economies across the world. Of course not all of them are free market-based economies like America's economy. It was the whole gamut of economies across the world, and they asked a very simple question and one that would be prudent for us to look at now as we are engaging in this economic debate, and it is this: What are the courses of action that causes an economy to climb and to grow and to find prosperity? Just exactly what we are trying to find now here in the midst as we grapple with these very real problems. What is the way out? And conversely, what is not the way out? What causes economies to contract, to fail, to have hyperinflation ensue, to see a misery index go up? What is that policy? And this is the result. I think for the common sense quotient that makes up most Americans today, the answer is not real startling.

This Harvard study from 2002 that looked at 18 different economies said this: When nations have contracted their spending, when they have brought their spending under control and reduced their spending, when they have lowered the amount of spending that they pay for government wages so they aren't increasing government public wages, in fact they are lowering government wages, and when those same economies cut taxes for the peo-

ple of the government, then you see the economies turnaround and you see the economies thrive and you see the economies grow.

The study also found just the converse. It found that where nations decided that the answer to the economic problem would be to grow spending, in fact dramatically increase spending, to increase wages for public employees in the government sector, where taxes would be increased on the people and burdens would be heaped up on both businesses and on private individuals, again the common sense quotient that makes up the great majority of American people won't be surprised by the results from this Harvard study.

These are the results: the results are when governments decide to dramatically increase spending, as the current Obama administration and the current Democrat-controlled Congress is about to engage in and in fact have engaged in, then government economies at that point fall into a spiral. It becomes negative, the revenue that comes in, and there is not growth out of the economy.

That only makes sense because where do governments have to go to finance what they have to do. There is one place that they have to go, and that is in my pocket and in the pocket of the American consumer and that is in the pocket of private industry.

Now there are some nations that don't allow for private industry. They have government-controlled economies. We have seen that in the living laboratory of the last 100 years of history across the world. We have seen the engine, the greatest engine of prosperity known to man through the annals of history which would be the United States free market capitalist-based system.

You look at the dramatic growth and increase of standard of living, opportunity and freedom, it has occurred on America's watch from 1900 to the year 2000. You saw dramatic growth and wealth creation like we have never seen before in the history of the world.

In fact, up until about 2006, we saw the greatest wealth enhancement in recent times. Under six of the eight years of President Bush, we saw some of the greatest increases in private wealth enhancement than we had ever seen in all of history. How did that happen? How did that occur? Well, it didn't occur because of dramatic increases in government spending. Where it occurred was the genius of private wealth creation. That is what America has given to our people. We have given the genius of freedom which in turn has given us the genius of prosperity and the genius of private wealth creation. It is what I wish for my parents. It is what I wish for my children. It is what I wish for my neighbors, that they would have private wealth sufficient to be able to satisfy not only themselves, but so that they can give out of their bounty to others. And that is what we have seen occur in this country, and the ge-

nius of wealth creation in private hands that has led to some of the greatest levels of compassion and of charitable giving that we have ever seen in the history of our country.

But what has been the response of the Obama administration? President Obama in his State of the Union address stood in this Chamber addressing this body as well as the United States Senate and the American public. And he said very simply and unashamedly, he planned to cut the deduction that Americans can take for charitable giving.

Now I don't know about you, but I think it is very good, Madam Speaker, to encourage Americans to give more money to the charity of their choice. Whether it is their local church, and local churches and religious groups were the groups which began America's hospital system. In every community across the United States, we boast wonderful hospitals—Presbyterian hospitals, Lutheran hospitals, Catholic hospitals, Baptist hospitals. Denominations saw to it that in their local communities, they weren't just meeting the needs of their parishioners only—only of Catholics, only of Presbyterians, only of Lutherans—they saw as Christ reached out to the infirm with his own hand, that they wanted to reach out in a charitable context and reach the needs of people beyond their own denominational doors, reach out to literally give a glass of cold water to those who were infirm, and meet the health care needs of those in their community.

I worry, Madam Speaker, I fear, Madam Speaker, that as President Obama is seeking to cap the gift giving that Americans will now be able to do to their local churches, to their local hospitals, to their local charitable institutions, that we will see these great givers of gifts, local charities, dry up. Why, because the Federal Government, the philosophical direction that President Obama has taken is that he believes the Federal Government can do a far better job spending your money than the American people can spending their own money. Madam Speaker, I beg to differ. No one spends their money better than the individual, and no one needs their money more right now than the individual. No single mother needs their money more right now than that single mother who may have three kids, who may have four kids.

I know personally in my own life when my mother found herself a single mother after a divorce that left her with four children, she had to take a low-paying job because she was determined that her children would be fed, sheltered and clothed. There wasn't much money available. We went immediately overnight from being middle class to being below poverty. But I had a mother who was determined that her children would have shelter. We didn't have a home any longer in the suburbs. That had to be sold. But we had an



apartment, we had somewhere to live, and my mother made sure that she worked. And I began at about age 12 getting baby-sitting jobs. My brothers got newspaper routes. We did what families are doing today. They are doing whatever it takes so they can survive so their children can have a meal tonight when they come home from school. They are doing whatever they can.

So, Madam Speaker, it strikes me as cruel that a philosophical decision has been made by the Obama administration and by the Democrat leadership that runs both the House and the Senate now in Washington, D.C., every lever of power today is controlled by the Democrat majority, and that decision has been made. Clearly it has been made affirmatively, and it has been made time and time again in the last 50 days of this administration. And it has been that we need to spend more money which in turn will mean the poor American people will have to be taxed almost into poverty to pay for this profligate spending.

Madam Speaker, I would ask: what is this emergency spending that the President believes must be done to save the economy? And I think, Madam Speaker, that it would sicken the American people if they knew what some of these spending projects are. Here are some among them. My colleague, Representative JASON CHAFFETZ of the Third Congressional District of Utah talked a little bit about the stimulus bill that is costing the American taxpayers well over a trillion dollars with debt service.

We received that bill and had only limited hours to be able to debate and vote on that bill. But the nasty little secret, Madam Speaker, that the American people are sadly learning is that not one Member of Congress was given an opportunity to read this bill before we were asked to vote on the highest spending bill that has ever come before this body. Ever in the history of man, no one has ever spent in one fell swoop a trillion dollars before in a spending measure. And the Members of this body, the people's representatives, weren't even given the courtesy of reading this bill which broke every promise that was made to the American people during the course of the last election.

On the campaign trail, we heard over and over again from then-Senator Obama that he wished to give the American people 5 days to read these bills online so the people's representatives would have time to read these bills before we vote on them. He wanted to ensure complete transparency, complete openness. We cheered President Obama when we heard that, and we are sadly disappointed that President Obama has chosen, together with the Democrat leadership that runs Congress, that they did not want, that they were so ashamed, could it be, of the stimulus bill, we don't know what their motives were, we don't know. But

what would lead them to keep this bill in hiding?

As a matter of fact, there isn't one Republican word in the trillion-dollar spending bill, not one word of bipartisan support. There were some offers of bipartisanship that we heard in the press, but no real extending of the hand to the American people to have true bipartisan intervention in this bill.

As a matter of fact, President Obama came over to meet with the Republicans, and we were so delighted. When President Obama came over to the Capitol, the Republicans in the House came together. We welcomed President Obama. When he came in our closed-door meeting, we prayed for our President and we promised him that we will pray for him at every meeting and that we will also have an open door to him. We have an eternal olive branch held out to President Obama because we want to be able to work with him. However, what we saw was that olive branch was not extended to the House Republicans.

□ 1545

We were not invited to those negotiations. As a matter of fact, the ranking member, the House Republican, lead member on the House Ways and Means Committee—and that would be Ranking Member U.S. Representative DAVE CAMP from the great State of Michigan—he said he was walking to the rotunda, and never in his career here in Congress has this ever happened to him. He walked past Senator HARRY REID, who was at a microphone announcing that a deal had already been struck in negotiations on the stimulus bill. Where was Representative CAMP going? He was going to attend the conference committee that was supposed to come up with the agreement on the stimulus bill. Representative CAMP, the Republican, hadn't even yet made it into the conference committee meeting and Senator HARRY REID was already at the microphone announcing that an agreement had been made.

The Republicans had been had. But what was worse, Madam Speaker, the American people had been had because there was no bipartisan agreement. We questioned President Obama. One of our Members, Representative ROSCOE BARTLETT from the State of Maryland, said, Mr. President, I have lived through the Great Depression, I have seen it. What evidence do you have that this radical spending and radical government intervention into a troubled economy will be able to pull our economy out of these current doldrums? Because it's never occurred before in the history of America where radical spending has literally brought us back to American prosperity. Prosperity does not follow spending. Prosperity follows the belt tightening that government has to do so the American people have more of their own money to spend.

When our Member, Representative BARTLETT, asked this question of the

President, here was the President's response; he said, I disagree with your premise. He said, I believe that the problem with President Roosevelt is that he failed to spend too much in the 1930s. I, for one, was incredulous, Madam Speaker, when I heard President Obama say that he believed that President Roosevelt failed to spend too much to bring the economy out of the doldrums. That was amazing. No President has ever intervened more, has ever spent more. In fact, many historians agree that what was a recession that President Roosevelt inherited turned into a Great Depression. And we don't want to see that happen again for the sake of our children, for the sake of the United States economy.

And then the question was asked about taxes to our President. He was asked about the massive tax increases that will surely result as night follows day from all these dramatic spending increases. And President Obama said simply this—he was attempting to be humorous, and he said, Well, I live down the street in a very nice house, Pennsylvania Avenue, 1600. I really like it there. And he said, I don't have a lot of expenses and I don't pay property taxes; I can afford to pay a little more. And again, I was incredulous by that statement. It almost reminded me of Marie Antoinette when she said, "Let them eat cake," meaning that the rest of us aren't living in public housing, the rest of us are struggling with the day-to-day expenses that we deal with. We are all in need of as much money as we can keep in our own hands, not sending it on to the Federal Government.

We have joining us in the Chamber right now another representative from the great State of Missouri. His name is TODD AKIN. And TODD AKIN has long been a champion against dramatic increases in government spending. He has long called on this body to get its house in order. And I will now yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. AKIN. Well, thank you, gentlelady. It's a treat to be able to join you this afternoon on the topic that I think arrests the attention of Americans everywhere, the state of our economy, and what should and could the government be doing about it?

If we just back up a small amount and try to frame the question, we go back to a time, a number of years ago, when there were created these Freddie and Fannie quasi corporate entities. And what happened was, under President Clinton what happened was that they decided they were going to increase the number of loans that were going to be made to people who couldn't afford to pay their loans—which is a little bit of a risky thing. And so we created these entities and we issued a whole bunch of loans to people.

And while the real estate market was doing well, it looked okay on the surface. And then, as everybody knows, what happened was the real estate bubble popped, and now all of a sudden you



have this socialistic kind of policy that was implemented by the Democrats that was supposedly to help people with loans, and now the whole thing is collapsing and people say, well, this is a failure of free enterprise. It's not. It's a failure of another one of these government programs that's trying to take two plus two and get eight out of it. So that's essentially what happened.

If you want to take a look at the New York Times, you can look at September 11, 2003. And you can see what happened in 2003, and that was the President, President Bush at that time, was saying, hey, we've got problems with Freddie and Fannie, you've got to give me authority to regulate these guys. And a Member of the House here, Congressman FRANK, said there's no trouble with Freddie and Fannie. A couple of years later it turned out he was radically wrong, and now the whole world is in an economic tailspin because we had these loan programs. Well, that's where we are.

So the question then becomes, what should we do? Well, obviously we shouldn't keep making loans to people who can't afford to pay them. But the other thing that you know in a recession is this; you don't want the government spending too much money. Well, why would that be? Well, because there is an effect that goes on. When the government spends too much money, it's like a big vacuum, it sucks that liquidity out of the regular private sector. And the private sector are the very ones that have to fix the problem.

To get the economy going, you've got to get the private sector going. The government can do anything it wants, it can do handsprings and all this sort of stuff, but the government makes no wealth whatsoever, all it does is spend wealth. It can print money, it can tax people, it can spend money, but it doesn't create prosperity, it doesn't create efficiencies. It simply can hamper the process.

So what's going on here? You've got two basic theories about what you do in a recession. One of them was started by FDR. And he had a guy, this fellow here that I have a quote, his name was Morgenthau. Morgenthau was Secretary of Treasury under FDR—and this is the first theory of what to do. And Morgenthau's idea was, we're going to spend a whole lot of money to stimulate the economy, and that will make everything better—because we're starting to enter into a recession back in the 1930s. And so Morgenthau, along with this Little Lord Keynes—who was a little weird—came up with this idea that they were going to spend a whole lot of money. And so they did it. And here at 1939, after he's done this for 8 years, Morgenthau meets with the Ways and Means Committee, and he takes a look and says, we've tried spending money. We've spent more than we've ever spent before, and it doesn't work. I say after 8 years of the administration, we have just as much unemployment as when we started, and

enormous debt to boot. So that's one theory. The theory is—and this is one that the liberals have always liked because they love to spend money—is if you spend enough money, you can get out of trouble.

It's a little bit like if I were to tell those of you here today, reach down, grab your shoe laces and lift hard and fly around the House Chamber. That's what this is like doing. And, you know, there isn't hardly an American family I can think of that's dumb enough to support this idea, and Morgenthau finally figured it out in 1939. There's not an American family that would say, when you're in economic trouble, go buy a brand new car, spend money like mad because maybe things will be better the next day. We just know intuitively, when you get in trouble, you've got to hunker down a little bit. That's what you do in Missouri, you've got to hunker down and use a little common sense. So this theory doesn't work.

Now, what's the other approach? What do you do when you have a recession? Can the government do anything? Well, it can. What it should be doing is not spending so much money, which is the topic of the congresswoman's discussion this afternoon. We're doing the wrong thing, we're spending too much money. The reason that that doesn't work is it pulls money out of the basic, particularly out of the places in the economy that need to have money in order to create jobs and productivity.

So, you see, jobs here, they had a big problem with unemployment. Eight years of government spending, they still had a big problem with unemployment. Now, what we've done is spent money like mad in the last couple of months, and people say, I'm not sure it's going to work. The stock market is saying, I don't think that's going to work. And history says, I don't think that's going to work. And the Japanese tried it and they say, that didn't work for us. You don't want to go spending a whole lot of money when you're in trouble.

What do you want to do? Well, here's what you want to do. You want to make sure particularly that the small business people have enough liquidity to get their companies going. And so what you want is policies that are going to keep money in small businesses so they will invest because 80 percent of the jobs are in small business. You've got unemployment? You want small businesses going like mad to create more jobs.

And so how do you do that? You let the small businessman keep money so that he can plow it back into the business, create the jobs that create the productivity. You need people who are entrepreneurs and who are inventors and investors. You want those people with the liquidity to be able to get the economy jump-started. And that means the government has got to stop spending money.

Well, what way are we spending money? Wow, we're really spending

money. This last thing that they called the stimulus package—I call it the porkulous package—I'm on Armed Services, we deal with things like military things. And one of the biggest, most expensive things in our budget is called an aircraft carrier. We have ships surround them to protect them. We've got 11 of them. They're really expensive and they're really big, and we protect them because 11 of them are very valuable. And they cost about \$3 billion apiece.

So what we passed in the House, do you know how many aircraft carriers you could buy for the money we borrowed that our kids and grandchildren have to pay back? You could make 250 aircraft carriers. Can you picture 250 aircraft carriers in a row? That's an incredible number. Or if you want to look at it a different way, you've heard us complain, you've heard the media complain about how big the spending was in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Add the spending in Iraq and Afghanistan together totally for both wars, add it up. Well, we spent more than that in the first 5 weeks we were here in Congress this year. That's a lot of spending.

And now here we've got, on top of that, here's the President's tax increases for 2010. And what exactly does this big tax policy do? One, this is cap and trade. What this is is global warming, which means your electricity and your power is going to be more expensive. Guess who uses that? Small businesses. This is going to be hammering not only to small people, not people making a lot of money, the little guys. You have to pay an electric bill? You're going to get hit with this tax. This bit about this is just for rich people is baloney. If you have an electric bill, you're going to pay this tax.

And this one over here is on small business. Both of these things affect small business. This is exactly the wrong thing to be doing. Tax increases is not what we should be doing. We should be going in the opposite; we should leave the money in the small businessman's pocket to create the jobs.

And the gentlelady, Congresswoman BACHMANN, I really appreciate you taking some time to talk about the economics because this is on the minds and hearts of Americans. I appreciate your sharing a little bit of your time on the floor with me.

I see you have some other distinguished colleagues here that are very qualified to talk on this subject, so I don't want to rattle on too long. But I thank you very much for giving me a few minutes.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you for yielding back.

The gentleman from Missouri, TODD AKIN, is so well respected in Missouri for a reason; he's a great historian and a lover of history. And I had done some reading myself on depression-era economics because that's really, I think, a very important area for us to look at

right now when you look at the parallel and compare and contrast between the policies that are being implemented today and the parallel nature that they have with the 1930s. Eleanor Roosevelt said that there were only two people who could say anything to her husband and cross him; one of them was Henry Morgenthau. And Henry Morgenthau, the United States Treasurer, as Mr. AKIN had stated, was one of the people who came to the very clear conclusion that overspending had been a huge mistake. And that is the focus of this Special Order hour this evening is on spending. And we saw that, throughout the 1930s, a misery index unlike any other had been created because of rampant out-of-control spending. And Henry Morgenthau said—probably the person who could testify the best to that level of government intervention—it was wrong, it was a mistake, it didn't work. And the one thing we know about history is if we don't learn from it, we will live to repeat it.

And I believe, Representative AKIN, you can correct me, that it seems that you are saying clearly to the American people, let's not, President Obama and the Democrats who run the House and Senate here in Washington, repeat that same mistake.

I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AKIN. I think you're absolutely right. And that is definitely my point. The point is it was tried under FDR. You can at least say they were trying a new theory of how to get the economy going. And they tried it and it didn't work and he made it clear it didn't work. And now, apparently the Japanese didn't learn too much from our history, so they tried it for 10 years, did all kinds of government spending like mad, and they basically wasted 10 years of the productive use of their own economy because the Japanese knew it didn't work.

And the thing that's ironic is, not only do we know what doesn't work, we know what does work. JFK and Ronald Reagan, both of them did the right kind of tax cuts. The economy turned around. We had long periods of very productive, good economic times in America because they did the right thing. Why don't we use the good example? Well, I think part of the reason is because we have a mindset now in Washington, DC, that big government is God and it knows better how to spend our money. And we just like spending a whole lot of money, but it's not what's going to make the economy better. And there are going to be more and more of your and my constituents who are going to be suffering because they don't have jobs, they've got mortgages that are too big, and they're really feeling the squeeze.

And it's a shame when you can't learn when history is staring you right in the face. But I really appreciate your putting the focus where it belongs in this excessive government spending. And you can take a look at billions and

billions of dollars—and the numbers just seem so big, but when you put it in perspective, the whole war in Iraq, the whole war in Afghanistan, added together, spent by this House in the first 5 weeks of this year, that's a lot of money, that's an awful lot of money. But I do see we have some experts on the floor, and I thank the gentlelady for yielding me time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri again, Mr. AKIN.

And this is a tremendous historic shift in philosophy that has occurred in the last 50 days. Again, the Obama administration, what's occurring—and this just came out in the Washington Times, "The world loses over \$50 trillion." The markets are responding, the markets aren't happy.

□ 1600

When they take a look at this massive government spending and, as Mr. AKIN had said, the new shift that says that government is God, what we are doing now is we are embarking on a new level of tyranny never seen before in the history of this country. And that's really the divide: liberty/tyranny. There is a constitutional scholar, Dr. Mark Levin, who's writing a book that's about to come out that talks about that chasm between liberty and tyranny. America was birthed out of liberty. We want to make sure that that continues.

And a cradle of liberty was the great State of Tennessee, and hailing from the Second Congressional District of Tennessee is Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN, one of the great gentlemen of this body, Mr. DUNCAN, with his words of wisdom on spending.

Mr. DUNCAN. I certainly want to first commend the gentlewoman from Minnesota. She has been a real leader in the Congress here in attempting to call attention to the great problems that we're going to face if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

And she just showed an article from the Washington Times. Just yesterday there was another article in the Washington Times that said the Polish currency had dropped 60 percent in value since last August and the Ukrainian currency had dropped in value 43 percent just since last September. And those are the kinds of things that we're going to face.

A few years ago, I was told that in Argentina, they got into such bad fiscal or financial shape that suddenly they had to start raising the prices in the grocery store every 4 hours. And the American people, I don't think, realize how tough and how difficult and how extreme our problems are going to become if we don't get our fiscal house in order.

It's mind-boggling, in fact, it's incomprehensible, that Congress voted a few months ago, and we voted against it, but they voted to raise our national debt to \$11.315 trillion. And nobody can really comprehend a figure like that, but what it really means is that it's

not going to be long at all before we're not going to be able to pay all of our Social Security and veterans' pensions and all of the things we've promised our own people with money that will buy anything, and people are going to face some really tough times if we're not careful.

Some of our leaders are looking dreamily back at the New Deal, and our colleague from Missouri just gave a quotation from one of President Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet members. What we are doing now is, unbelievably to me, astoundingly to me, we're almost making Franklin Roosevelt look conservative by what we're doing. And I have talked about debt that we have. Under the administration's most optimistic predictions, we are going to add \$4 trillion more to our debt over the next 3 years. I'm in my 21st year in the Congress. I never believed that we would be facing the kinds of deficits and debt that we're taking on and facing over these next 3 years. So I want to commend our colleague from Missouri, Congressman AKIN, for his remarks. I heard a lot of the things he had to say, and I know that Judge CARTER, our colleague from Texas, is going to speak shortly, and I'm going to just take just another minute or two. But I think this problem that's being discussed here is so very important, we can't emphasize it enough because it overrides and affects everything else that we are talking about here in the Congress.

David Walker, who's the former head of the GAO, has been going all over this country over the last few months trying to be a Paul Revere and sound the warning about what we're facing and what we're getting into, and he talks about the \$11 trillion debt that we have, as mind-boggling as that is.

But what is even worse, in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers today, he has a column and he mentions, as he has mentioned before, that we have over \$56 trillion of unfunded future pension liabilities. Under our law if a private company sets up a pension plan for its employees, it has to fund it, and its leaders can be put in jail if they don't fund those private pension plans. But our leaders, we've done this very thing over these last few years. It started with the Great Society because President Lyndon Johnson didn't think people would stand in the late 1960s for huge deficits at that time, but what we did back then was just nothing, was minuscule, compared to what we're doing today.

We talked about the New Deal. A few days ago in the Washington Times, 203 leading university economists signed a full-page ad, and they said this:

"We, the undersigned, do not believe that more government spending is a way to improve economic performance. More government spending by Hoover and Roosevelt did not pull the United States economy out of the Great Depression in the 1930s. More government spending did not solve Japan's 'lost

decade' in the 1990s. As such, it is a triumph of hope over experience to believe that more government spending will help the U.S. today."

These economists, as I said, 203 leading university economists, continued and said this: "To improve the economy, policymakers should focus on reforms that remove impediments to work, saving, investment, and production. Lower tax rates and a reduction in the burden of government are the best ways of using fiscal policy to boost growth."

Unfortunately, we're going in the opposite direction now, and it is a very dangerous road. We're going down a socialist path, and socialism, my colleagues, has never worked anywhere in this world. If it had, the Soviet Union and Cuba would have been heavens on Earth. Instead, every place where we have let the government get too big and get out of control from a financial standpoint, we have ended up with a few elitists at the top, almost no middle class, and a huge starvation or underclass. That's the only thing government is good at is wiping out the middle class.

And what we have got to make more people realize is this: There's waste in the private sector, I recognize, just like there's waste in government. But the waste in the private sector pales in comparison to the waste that is in government. So every dollar that we can keep in the private sector does more to hold down prices and create jobs than does any money that's turned over to government, and that's been proven all over the country. And the best way we can help the poor and the lower income and the working people of this country is by keeping more of our money in the private sector where it will be spent much more economically and efficiently than it will be if we turn it over to the government.

I know there are others that want to speak, and I have taken up more time than I should have, but I once again want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for taking out this Special Order and for all the good work that she does in this Congress.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I appreciate the gentleman from Tennessee's Second Congressional District, Mr. JIMMY DUNCAN. He's a tremendous gentleman of the South but also a tremendous fighter for the people, the common man, who understand how they have to run their own family budget. And they look at this Congress and they look at this current Obama administration, and they are shaking their heads. In coffee shops and barber shops and beauty parlors all across the United States, Americans are disgusted because they know in their own life, they can't begin to spend that kind of money and think that their family can possibly remain afloat. And they know that they are going to suffer, that their local neighbor is going to suffer, that small businessmen are going to suffer, and suffer they will.

But that does not have to be our story in the United States. It can be completely different. The House Republicans have a very positive solution to all of this, and we can come out of these economic doldrums very quickly, and the solution is this: If we would zero out capital gains, the taxes that you have to pay when you invest your money, if we would zero that out for 4 years, people would invest in this economy. And if we would take the business tax, it's the small businesses, after all, that create 70 percent of all jobs in the United States. If we would take away their crushing burden and, instead of the second highest tax rate in the world, give them about one of the lowest rates in the world, 9 percent, make that a permanent tax.

Right now all across the world, nations are scared to death financially. They want to go somewhere where they can invest their money. Imagine if we would make the United States the premier place in the world to invest for business creation and advancement. We would bring jobs into the United States, high-paying jobs. Zero out the capital gains tax, 9 percent corporate tax, and then lower everyone's income tax by 5 percent. And the death tax, the most immoral tax there ever could possibly be, that Uncle Sam would reach into your coffin at the time of your death and say now you pay taxes once again. Get rid of that tax. Get rid of the alternative minimum tax. Our problem would then be finding enough workers to fill all the jobs.

Someone who understands this very well is a southerner named Judge John Carter from middle central Texas, representing Texas's 31st Congressional District. He has been a champion. He understands the devastation of overspending, and he's here to bring that, Mr. Speaker, to our body.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. She has done a wonderful job in expressing, I think, the mood of the country and the mood of the people in the country.

This weekend I had a great weekend. I opened up a park in one part of my district, then moved to another part of my district and opened another park. And then I went to something called a Daffodil Festival, which is put on by the elderly in our area to raise funds for their center. And there was a huge crowd there, and I just wandered around talking to people. I wasn't there to make a speech or do anything like that, just to talk. And it was amazing how much people wanted to talk about what's going on in Washington.

Maybe my part of the world is different from everybody's part of the world, but everybody that I talked to said we are scared to death about what we're spending our money on and how much of our money we're spending.

When you start tossing around trillions of dollars, those are numbers that the American people, it's so big, they don't conceive what it means. But

when somebody gives them an example like it's a stack of \$1,000 bills 63 miles high or if you started giving \$1 million away on the day Jesus was born, you still wouldn't have given away \$1 trillion today. Those kinds of numbers make people say, wow, that's a lot of money.

The average person, they know what they've got in their pocket. They know what the government takes out of their check every month. At least most of them do. And they know what they care about. They want to live a life where they can live the comfortable life of being a free American, the life of liberty that we created when we founded this country. And they see this spending to be enslaving not only this generation but generations and generations to come. And especially, especially, this is such a risk because we have the experience of the New Deal, which, according to the Secretary of Treasury Morgenthau, after 10 years, 9 years of trying, didn't work. He was the guy in charge of the program, and he said the spending didn't work.

Now, today there was a fact that came out and it was given to me as the truth. I don't know what the source was, but I think it is the truth, that we have now seen the most rapid fall in the stock market in American modern history, that history going back to 1900. Now, that means during the Great Depression the stock market didn't fall at the rate it has fallen now.

Now, I'm not telling people that to scare everybody because everybody is already scared. The truth is it's time for us to step up and say what would you do in your house if the ski was falling, as it seems to be falling in Washington, D.C. today? Most everybody would say, man, you know what we're doing? I'll tell you what we're doing. We're making sure we hold on to our jobs. We're making sure that we are going to have the resources to feed, clothe, and shelter our family first and foremost. We're going to take care of the basics, and we are not going to waste a dime in our budget.

I know waste is in the eye of the beholder, and, of course, I probably don't agree with many of the programs that the President has put into the budget and the stimulus package because we have a different view of government and of society. But I can tell you that there was so much put into the package that didn't even have a target to stimulate but rather was to promote an agenda which was a part of political promises that were made on the campaign trail. And when you're talking about three-quarters of \$1 trillion, almost, then you're talking about an awful lot of money being spent on promise and not on production.

□ 1615

What our job is here in Washington is to produce jobs for the American people.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I just wanted to give one illustration of this, and it

caused me to think of this when you were speaking, if you take a look at just the money that's been spent in the last 50 days, just in the past 50 days, let alone the debt that the Comptroller General David Walker said the American people owe, which is \$53 trillion in unfunded Federal debt liabilities, just in the last 50 days, the Obama administration and the Democrats that control the House and the Senate have spent and committed and put a burden on the back of every American household, \$18,500, \$18,500.

So not only do the American people have to figure out how to pay their water bill and their electric bill, they have got to figure out how to come up with \$18,500 just to come up with the spending of the last 50 days.

Mr. CARTER. And that spending was new spending.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's correct.

Mr. CARTER. That was new spending. You see, we are creating new spending. Well, just for example, we are expanding welfare spending by \$2.9 billion.

We were proud, and the Democrats and the Republican puffed our chests out when we said we fixed welfare in the 1990s. We did, but we turned it right back around in 2009 and put it right back where it was when we fixed it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I think the American people would be shocked to learn, because the welfare reform that passed in the 1990s was with a Republican House and a Democrat President, President Clinton, has been dramatically effective to reduce even illegitimate rates and reduce welfare rolls and reduce costs to taxpayers all across the country.

I think the American people would be shocked to learn that all of those positive reforms have been repealed in one fell swoop. In the stimulus package the Obama administration rolled back the positive reforms that Republicans, working hand-in-hand in a bipartisan way, were able to bring about for the American people.

Mr. CARTER. Here we have got some other things that are curious, Barney Frank's Affordable Housing Trust Fund of \$1 billion. Here is one, this is something that concerns me.

And I am going to state this on the record so it's very, very clear, that I did not vote for the stimulus bill, and I will tell you why I didn't vote for the stimulus bill. I spent almost the whole night before that vote talking with the former chairman of the FDIC, and the question that he couldn't answer, the question I couldn't get anybody in this House to answer, including my President, the President from my party and the Treasury Secretary from my party, the answers I wanted were what exactly are you going to do with this money?

And they said buy bad assets and other things. It was the "and other things" that I didn't like. It was the "and other things" that said who in their right mind gives a blank check to anybody? I don't care who they are.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's a tremendously powerful point that you are making, tremendously powerful. You cannot spend trillions of dollars and not see massive waste, fraud and abuse. In fact, it's so bad that a lawsuit was filed by Bloomberg Media to the Federal Reserve saying we would like the American people to see the data.

Who is getting these loans out of this \$350 billion, now \$700 billion, that have been spent on these bailouts? Every day the Federal Reserve is spending money in bailouts, but no one knows. No one knows, no one knows who is getting these loans, what is it for?

The American people deserve answers. The American people aren't getting them, and that's the kind of immorality that occurs when we have dramatic spending like we have never heard before. This is real people, real people are paying out this money. This is no joke. These are people that literally will become slaves to the government in order to pay their taxes in future years, and this is a crime for the next generation.

Mr. CARTER. I bring this up because I want to point out that one of the things we are about to do in the omnibus is health care reform fund, \$634 billion. Now, what does that mean, health care reform fund?

Well, we don't know what it means. Just yesterday the President was asked, are you a socialist, and he said, in several different answers, no, he was not. And yet you hear people say it's for some form of single-pay socialized medicine, but you don't get any commitment that's what it for. In fact, it just says "fund."

Mrs. BACHMANN. I wonder if this bill will come to us the same way that stimulus bill came after midnight, and then we are expected to take up the debate at 9:00 in the morning. In fact, experts said we had 23 seconds per page to read that bill.

It was a slap in the face to the American people to spend that kind of money in stimulus, and now you are talking socialized medicine. This is nationalizing. This administration loves to nationalize every aspect of every American industry that there is. The health care industry, which could be 18 percent of our economy, in one fell swoop, could be nationalized.

Mr. CARTER. Even more important, the Constitution of the United States says the Congress initiates spending, not the executive, the Congress.

I have absolutely nothing against the President, this is not any criticism, any man sitting in that office, not just Barack Obama, but any person, male or female, and if you give them a blank check and they don't tell you what they are going to use it for—\$634 billion, then Congress is not doing its duty.

Mrs. BACHMANN. It doesn't matter which person is in that office, which party.

#### EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND WASTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUJÁN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Well, it's hard to change from one bicycle ride to another one, but we will give it a shot anyway and finish up what we were talking about on that spending.

I just want to tell a story to you about a little old, a real good little school that's in my district, Tarleton State University, who took on a project which was started by Congressman Stenholm and then later supported by me to do a little data mining on crop insurance. This is a relatively small but important program used in the farm community, crop insurance.

And they wanted to see if they could find, by doing data mining, waste, fraud and abuse. And, in reality, they found and actually, I guess, went forward on, prosecuted, \$500 million, a half a billion, \$500 million of waste, fraud and abuse in the crop insurance program. This is a little small but good university in central Texas.

They also, by going actually going after these people, turned around, they estimated, another \$1 billion worth of crop insurance fraud that was out there. Now, if Tarleton State University, this fine little school in my district, can go out and do a data mining project on a small program and find that kind of waste, fraud and abuse, what could we find in a put together rapidly massive spending program like we have been describing in the previous hour?

I think that's what the American people want this government to do. They want to find out where we are cheating and wasting the government and getting rid of it, and they want us to put together a tax structure that encourages businesses to hire people. I had a conversation, and this will be the last thing I will say on this, I had a conversation with a family, a Hispanic family, four or five, I forget, at that fiesta I was telling you I went to.

They were talking about one of them lost his job, the other two had gone on reduced hours, and you know what their comment was? They made a joke about I haven't received my check yet, about the famous percentage check they thought they were going to get.

And then they laughingly said and got serious, they said, we don't want a check, we want a job. And we want something to turn around to where people want to keep their jobs open. Let us work a full, 40-hour week. We want to work. We are not looking for a handout.

I really think that's the American people and that's what they stand for, and I think that is our challenge that we go forward on that. But today there are some other issues that I think there are issues that go hand-in-hand

with what we are doing with the economy, because in reality, the real issue of what drives the markets and what drives the confidence of the American people support the trust issue.

It's can we trust the people we put in charge of this mess in Washington to be doing this thing as straight and as straightforward as they honestly can without any particular person or agenda or personal profit from the procedure, but, rather, to be doing the best they can for the American people. Can we trust them?

And that's really what we are up here about. You know, when I ran for Congress, I made the statement, which I was loaned from JOHN CULBERSON, his campaign, that it's all about who do you trust to go a couple of thousand miles away from home and do what they say they are going to do.

Well, that's the real issue. The real issue is trust. If we start to see it, and in the last Congress, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they came up with the culture of corruption and used it very effectively to defeat Republicans and raised issues, certain issues that ended up with people going to prison, and I understand that.

But that doesn't mean when we change that those issues all of a sudden don't matter any more to be discussed, because they need to be discussed, and we have issues right now that are destroying the underpinnings of trust that the American people have for those who are in charge.

And I have, on a couple of occasions prior to today come in and talked about the Rangel rule. I was interested to see this morning on the news, some gentleman wrote in to the IRS that he had failed to pay his taxes and he was going to catch up when he could. Until that time, he was exercising the Rangel rule, and he named three or four other people's rule, and that he didn't expect to pay penalties and interest when he got caught up with his taxes.

Well, I didn't tell you that was the law, I told you that's what I thought the law ought to be. But the point is somebody gets it, that's not fair. Somebody gets it, how can you trust somebody when they get special privileges and you don't?

Then I picked up this morning's newspaper, Roll Call, and I find that we have got another issue that ought to be talked about, and these are people that we work with and we respect, and there may be an explanation, but I think we are owed an explanation. Congressman MOLLOHAN, according to this morning's paper, his family foundation received \$75,000 worth of free rent from a group that he helped start and he got millions of dollars of earmarks for so they could exist, and he got \$75,000 worth of free rent for his family foundation.

I don't know if that's a bad thing or a good thing, but it doesn't sound right. It doesn't meet the "taint right test." Maybe it does meet the "taint right test," and something needs to be explained.

I am not calling anybody corrupt, like we were called corrupt, which, by the way, irritated the heck out of me. But, I am saying it ought to be explained, and I am saying that it is part of what I have been talking about, that there is accountability that's required of folks in this House.

Besides the things that I have raised against Chairman RANGEL and the taxes, there are those and other things. I have a poster over there, which I guess I am not going to put up, I forgot to, but it shows a long line of people waiting in New York City to sign up for rent-subsidized apartments.

And by Mr. RANGEL's own admission on the floor of this House, he had four rent-subsidized apartments—and I understand none of which qualified to live in—that he knocked out walls and made it into one big apartment and a campaign headquarters in a building where lines were going around the corner for families who were entitled to live in rent-subsidized apartments were waiting to get in.

I think that needs to be more adequately explained than it was. Just by turning yourself into the ethics department does not mean that you have answered the question.

□ 1630

So these issues are issues that are with us. They are issues that, if we are going to talk about trust in Washington, we have got to also be able to talk about trust from the American people about the activities that are going on in Washington.

We learned that the Chief of Staff of the White House, Rahm Emanuel, he lived rent-free in an apartment that was owned partially by one of our Members, Ms. DELAURO, but also owned by her husband, who the DCCC, which Rahm Emanuel is in charge of, gave \$500,000 in projects to do I think it was surveys and such and so and so. So, he benefitted of a value of \$100,000 worth of free rent over a 5-year period of time, and it can be argued that he gave contracts to the people that he benefitted from. Now, maybe that's not what happened.

You know, I used to tell juries all the time—for 20 years, I looked every juror in the eye and said, You're not to read anything about this case in the newspaper, watch anything on television, or listen to anything on the radio about this case. Because, believe it or not, sometimes the newspapers get things wrong. And they would all laugh because they knew that was the truth.

And I'm just saying, we have at this time probably the biggest crisis in American history, certainly in my lifetime, and I have been around much longer than the Speaker has, and I can tell you that this is the biggest crisis. And I had a man, one of the most highly respected former Members of this body, both sides of the aisle respect and love him—I won't use his name because I don't want people to know how he feels—but he said, Never, in all the

things I have been through, war, recessions, and other things, have I ever been so concerned for the future of my country as I am today.

When that kind of statesman makes those kind of statements, we are in a time where at least it is the feeling of our Nation that we are worried about the future. And we are worried and want to trust those we have put in office. And I want them to be able to trust us.

So, I am saying when I raise these issues, these are issues that cause more distrust. And they need to be responded to, and they need to be resolved. Quite frankly, they need to be resolved, in many instances, by a body of this House—the Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee needs to function.

And I don't know if the American people would think, if they don't know the Ethics Committee, they would say, Why wouldn't it function? I don't know. I'm not on the Ethics Committee. But I can tell you this. It's a committee made up of 50 percent Democrats and 50 percent Republicans. If everybody votes their party line, nothing happens, because it's 50-50.

So, it's a serious committee to be assigned. It's a committee that requires you to sit in judgment upon your fellow Members and to do what is right for America, not what is right for either party or any Member of this House, but what is right for the United States of America under the rules we operate under.

That Ethics Committee needs to function, and it needs to function now.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, I appreciate the remarks that you're making regarding ethics. Ethics, after all, is the study of what's right and what's wrong. That is really, if you want to get down to the brass tacks, that is what ethics is all about—what is right, what is wrong.

And what the gentleman has been talking about is the behavior of Members of this body, as well as the actions that Members of this body take, that lead to what's right and what's wrong.

If we look at this current economic mess that we are in the middle of, what is the morality, what are the ethics that got us into this mess, what are decisions that Members of this body made?

We are taking our fingers right now—and our mothers often said to us, If you point your finger at someone, remember, there's always three fingers that point back at yourself.

One thing that I think would be a credit to this body is if we examine—now, I am a fairly new Member of this body. This is just the beginning of my second term. But we need to look, how did government contribute to this economic meltdown. How did individual Members, individual Senators, individual House Members contribute to this economic meltdown.

I believe that my colleague, Judge JOHN CARTER, is asking the right questions when it comes to ethics. And I

commend Speaker PELOSI, who said she wanted this to be the most open, ethical Congress ever when she took the gavel as Speaker of the House. We agreed with her. We applauded her for making that statement. However, what we have seen since that time has given us great concern.

The same with President Obama. He has said he wants the most open, ethical administration. But we have been very concerned about what we have seen. And I would just bring up one example of that, and that would be one of our former colleagues—my colleague, Judge JOHN CARTER, brought that up himself.

Again, we don't necessarily know the answers. We aren't a court of jurisdiction here. But we are asking questions that I think the American people have the right to know.

We know that the Chief of Staff of President Obama was one of our former colleagues. A very bright, intelligent man. But we wondered what was missed during the Obama team's vetting process because the Chief of Staff served on the Freddie Mac Board of Directors. Why is this important?

When you look at the economic meltdown, what we often hear is that all roads lead to Freddie and Fannie. That is the government-sponsored entity that was the guarantor of all of these mortgages that are now falling—many of which are falling into disarray.

Well, our former colleague, the new Chief of Staff of the President, served on the Freddie Mac Board of Directors during the time that the Freddie Mac lied about its earnings. It was a leading contributor to this current economic meltdown.

The Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Agency later singled out Freddie Mac, that Board of Directors of which the current Chief of Staff sits on. And, again, we are not condemning. We just don't know. We are asking questions. That is all we are doing. We are not trying to cast aspersions.

But the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Agency said this; that the Board of Directors of Freddie Mac, of which the current Chief of Staff to the President sits on, contributed to the fraud that took place in 2000 and 2001 for, "failing in its duty to follow up on matters brought to its attention." In other words, the Board of Directors ignored the red flags that we are waving in their faces.

Later on, the Securities and Exchange Commission fined Freddie Mac \$50 million for deliberate fraud for those years, 2000, 2001, 2002.

The Chief of Staff currently for President Obama was paid more than \$260,000, again, according to records and, again, this has to be answered, for the service that he gave while he sat on that Board of Directors for Freddie Mac. And after he resigned from that Board to run for Congress in 2002, Freddie Mac, or the troubled agency's PAC, gave the current Chief of Staff of the President, gave his campaign

\$25,000, the largest single gift to a House candidate.

Well, again, this is incredible because currently the Chief of Staff to the President of the United States is in the process of trying to dig us out of the mess that it appears Freddie Mac started, all while he sat on the Board of Directors and information was given to that Board.

Again, we don't know. And I agree with my colleague, Judge CARTER, we don't know what those answers are. But surely the American people deserve to have answers. They deserve to have answers about Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. Who knew what; what did these Board of Directors know; what did they attempt to do, what was their role in all of this? After all, they were fined by the FDIC for their failure to be diligent. Who would have suspected that that failure could have resulted in a multitrillion-dollar meltdown that has brought a terrible disservice to our country, as well as the Community Reinvestment Act.

We need to know what did, for instance, Chairman FRANK, who's currently the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, of which I am a member, what did he know during his time? We know that he has made statements that Freddie Mac was in good condition, Fannie Mae was in good condition, when in fact they weren't in good condition.

What we need to get are answers. What did Members of Congress know about these organizations? Did they contribute or didn't they contribute to their failure? The American people know these are ethical questions because ethics is an issue of what is right, of what is wrong, and we all stand before the American people. None of us are perfect. We don't pretend to be perfect. But the American people deserve answers because we are in a very precarious situation right now and, Judge CARTER, I want to thank you for bringing these questions up before the American people.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentlelady. Reclaiming my time, I want to point out this is the same Rahm Emanuel who I think flippantly said, A crisis is a terrible thing to waste. As he added all these programs that had been promised programs of various sorts into the various spending bills that we had, he made that statement.

That statement has been quoted on multiple occasions in the newspaper. Probably a flippant statement. But it shows the cynicism within which this whole thing is viewed, and it undermines the trust that we are supposed to have for the people that are in charge.

Mrs. BACHMANN. If the gentleman would yield, I would just add to that. That statement has been repeated many times, and American people wonder exactly what that means. But it's not a standalone statement. That was something that the current Chief of Staff to the President said, but also our Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton,

just last week in Brussels, advised a European audience to, Never waste a good crisis.

Those were her words. Exactly what the Chief of Staff to the President said. In fact, 5 days before President Obama became President, he said that we are, "5 days away from fundamentally transforming the United States of America."

Judge CARTER. I think you would agree with me, the last 50 days of American history we have seen a fundamental transformation of the United States of America, and Americans have questions.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, that is exactly what we have seen. And that is exactly what I think these statements mean. I mean, when we're talking about that trust factor, I don't think that anyone, including the President of the United States, ran on that he was going to fundamentally change the United States of America. What he said was: Hope. Give hope a chance. We are going to bring a new world to this world. But he didn't say, I'm going to change the whole United States government. And maybe it won't. We are still a democracy. And life changes as we move through this 4-year period of time.

But getting back to what I'm here to talk about, which is what we've been talking about, is accountability and ethics. And I want to continue to emphasize that I do this out of no malice toward any of the individuals, and I would hope that all of those issues are resolved favorably. The reason I would hope that is I'm not in the business, as others have been, of burning down this House. That's a slogan that's been used for years, but nobody ever went that far. That is far enough to where the American people distrusted the Congress. Yet, we are sitting still at around a 20 percent approval rating, both sides, the Senate and the House. So that means 80 percent of the people don't approve of us.

It's because we burn down the Congress. We called each other corrupt. I'm a person who believes that every person has the right to be heard and every person has the right to a fair defense. Everyone. And I would hope that we hear those defenses and see those defenses, because the list goes on and on.

John Murtha, with the millions of dollars he's funneling to companies in his district, with the explanation that they create jobs. Yet, those questions by Defense Department to see if they even have a purpose. Hilda Solis, who is the Treasurer of the America's Right to Work Association, which were fiduciary duties, and she lobbied Congress and took direction action. None of those things would entitle her to be holding office. She failed to pay taxes to the IRS for 16 years. Nothing has been done about that.

William Jefferson is under indictment for \$90,000 in cash in his freezer. The cold cash case. I'm sure that's



going to be resolved sometime, now that it is in the court system. And it goes on and on.

We have Tim Mahoney, who was using taxpayer funds to pay extortion to a former staffer to keep his mistress a secret from his wife. The voters kept him from coming to Congress. Recently, Senator BURRIS, who now it's pretty clear that there are accusations that he perjured himself when he gave testimony about the Governor's campaign funds, and yet no one seems to be wanting to do anything about that. This just goes on and on and on.

□ 1645

And, quite frankly, there is so much more to go, I don't really want to go into it. I have talked about some of these things previously.

And what is the issue that I am trying to bring forth here? The issue that I am trying to bring forth here is: Government, when you send someone to Washington, whether you send them 100 miles or 50 miles away from home, or whether you send them 2,000 miles away from home, you expect to be able to trust those people to do what they said they would do and to stand for what they say they stand for. And one of the things you want to know is that these people are trustworthy.

Now, when we have issues like this that are raised without being answered and we have a body whose job it is to resolve those issues, the Ethics Committee, and the Ethics Committee is not doing their job, or if they are we are not seeing the results, then you can't expect people in Wichita, Kansas, or Round Rock, Texas, or San Francisco, California, to hear these things and see these things and not wonder, are those people trustworthy enough to be taking care of my business in the Nation's capital? And I think many of them would then say, if it sticks to one, it sticks to all; which is basically the message that was put out by the Democrats in the last Congress.

I don't agree that if it sticks to one, it sticks to all. I think any time you gather the amount of people that gather in this Congress there are going to be mistakes made. I don't think you can get past it. And I think you can take any body of people, even any membership in a church, and you are going to find that there are issues that would cause people to be concerned. That is not our job. Our job is to make sure that we are the most honest, ethical Congress in history, as the Speaker has challenged us to be. And it is her job as the Speaker, I think, to promote going forward on these issues in every way she can to get these matters resolved; because until they are resolved, they deserve to be talked about, and when they are talked about they can't help but cause people to be concerned.

I am going to tell you that I have been in Congress now since 2002, and prior to that time I served 20 years as a trial judge in Georgetown, Texas, trying felony cases among other

things. But I can tell you, I have encountered an awful lot of people on both sides of the aisle in this Congress, and the vast majority of these people are beyond reproach and outstanding individuals and great Americans. They are working long, terrible hours, and wearing out a lot of shoe leather marching up and down these halls to subcommittee and committee hearings to make sure that the Nation's business is done to best of their ability. And that is why, as someone who believes that there is a world of right and wrong, good and evil, that it isn't what each person thinks it is, but there is a concept among humanity that says certain things are right and certain things are wrong. And you can't make it relative to anything. It is a fact.

As one who believes that way, I think it is our duty, and, in particular, it is my mission to point these things out and say let's resolve these issues. And that is part of my message here, because I don't want the vast, vast majority of the people in this Congress tainted. I don't care what party they are in, I don't want them tainting the whole body politic of the Congress. There are just too many good people here working too hard to do the right thing, what they and their constituents perceive to be the right thing. That is as it should be.

But for us to not address these issues, allow them to be swept under the carpet and forgotten, whenever you mention something and it just logs a little thought pressed in the back of somebody's brain, it is always there until it is resolved. We need to resolve these issues and they need to be resolved properly. And if we are going to put people who have unresolved issues in a position of authority in this Congress, I think that brings consequences that are grave to the Congress and this Nation.

So, therefore, if people are in a position where ethics is questioned, morality is questioned, it is for the good of the Congress that they not serve in those positions. It happens to be a Republican party rule that if someone is indicted, they must step down from the position of leadership. And that actually occurred in the last Congress.

I happen to be someone who, for 20 years, told juries every week: An indictment is nothing but a legal accusation. It is no proof of guilt, and no assumption of guilt should be taken by any member of the jury based upon the indictment. It is a legal acquisition, a form by which the State knows what it has to prove and the defense knows what it has to defend. But the Republicans decided that was enough to require someone to step down, which is kind of above and beyond the call of duty; but if that is the standard, it ought to be the standard for everybody. Everyone should choose to adopt the high standards that are set by the highest of standards in this body.

So that is what I have been talking about in these days when I have come

in here, and that is what I will continue to talk about, because I believe in our court systems. I believe that our court systems are good sources of justice for the people who use them. And every time somebody walks out the door, one party is unhappy. But the fact is, they resolve the conflict, and they do it justly and fairly between the parties.

I believe we should justly and fairly deal with each other in this Congress, and I believe that we should justly and fairly respect each other in this Congress. And I believe that when there are issues which taint the Congress, we should be willing to demand those issues be resolved; and, if they aren't resolved, we should demand that the persons who are not trying to get it resolved step down from positions of authority that they may hold.

Now, that may be harsh, but I believe in justice. If you believe in justice, right is right and wrong is wrong. And if there is wrong and it goes unresolved, it is bad for the entire Nation and the world. And for that reason, I have been standing before this House many days all by myself, kind of the voice crying in the wilderness. Let's get to be a just body again. Let's get to be where people look at congressmen and say, I am proud to know that Congressman.

You know, when I ran for the Congress, I was in College Station, Texas, and I ran into three of my colleagues in the judiciary, trial judges, district judges, in College Station. And they asked me, why would anybody leave the branch of government that generally makes sense to go to the branch of government that never makes sense? And I laughed and I said, well, maybe an old judge can help make some of it make sense. And maybe not. But I also at that time thought they thought, and as I thought and still think, that the Congress is worthy of respect.

So that we may be a body worthy of respect, I raise these issues. I will continue to raise these issues until we have resolved these issues, and hopefully we can go forward in raising the standards for this body so that people look with respect upon the Congress of the United States of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.



(The following Members (at the request of Ms. FOXX) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, March 17.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today, March 11 and 12.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, March 17.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, March 11.

Mr. FLAKE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Concurrent Resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution calling on the President and the allies of the United States to raise the case of Robert Levinson with officials of the Government of Iran at every level and opportunity, and urging officials of the Government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance to the family of Robert Levinson and to share information on the investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Sailors of the United States Submarine Force upon the completion of 1,000 Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) deterrent patrols; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11, 2009, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

809. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Women's Final Four Fireworks Display, Ybor Turning Basin, Tampa Bay, Florida. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0095] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

810. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bay Area Destination Fireworks Display Seddon Channel, Tampa Bay, Florida [Docket No. USCG-2008-0089] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

811. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fort Lauderdale Super Boat Grand Prix, Atlantic Ocean, Offshore Fort Lauderdale, FL. [USCG-2008-0058] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

812. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Provision Fireworks Display [Docket No. USCG-2008-0023] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

813. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Old Tampa Bay, FL. [Docket No. USCG 2008-0024] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

814. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Haulover Cut, St. Thomas, USVI [Docket No. USCG-2007-0174] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

815. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Thames River Channel, New London, Connecticut [Docket No. USCG-2008-0004] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

816. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone; Columbia River, all water within 200 yards radius around the Ship ZHEN HUA 17. [USCG-2008-0139] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

817. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone; M/V Magdalena, Columbia River bank to bank from River Mile 75 to River Mile 77. [USCG-2008-0144] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

818. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Langley Air Force Base Air Show. Willoughby Point, Hampton, VA. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0159] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

819. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Red Bull Air Race; San Diego Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0162] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

820. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Island Creative Management, LLC Fireworks Dis-

play, San Francisco Bay, CA. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0194] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

821. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Benefit Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, CA. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0195] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

822. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Olympic Torch Ceremony, San Francisco Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0262] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

823. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; KFOG Kaboom Fireworks Display, San Francisco, CA. [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0261] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

824. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; San Francisco Giants Fireworks Display, San Francisco Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2008-0260] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

825. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Boat Fire Miami Beach Marina Salvage Operations [Docket No. USCG-2008-0257] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 26, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

826. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, American Legion, transmitting the financial statement and independent audit of The American Legion, proceedings of the 90th annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Phoenix, Arizona from August 22-28, 2008 and a report on the Organization's activities for the year preceding the Convention, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 49; (H. Doc. No. 111-23); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 813. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 306 East Main Street in Elizabeth City, North Carolina, as the "J. Herbert W. Small Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 111-27). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 837. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 799 United Nations Plaza in New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown United States Mission to the United Nations Building" (Rept. 111-28). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 842. A bill to designate the United States Courthouse to be constructed in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 111-29). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 869. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 101 Barr Street in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Scott Reed Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 111-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 887. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 131 East 4th Street in Davenport, Iowa, as the "James A. Leach United States Courthouse" (Rept. 111-31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 37. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (Rept. 111-32). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 38. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (Rept. 111-33). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 39. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 111-34). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 229. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-35). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 1404. A bill to authorize a supplemental funding source for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on Department of the Interior and National Forest System lands, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of Ohio:

H.R. 1405. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Head Start teachers the same above-the-line deduction for supplies as is allowed to elementary and secondary school teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRK:

H.R. 1406. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to reinstate the "uptick rule" on short sales of securities and to suspend the application of mark-to-market accounting principles; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 1407. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce cost-sharing under part D of such title for certain non-institutionalized full-benefit dual eligible individuals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 1408. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. HARE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FARR, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. WU, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. HALVORSON, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KIND, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BEAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of

Indiana, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KILROY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MASSA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HODES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KISSELL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BOCCIERI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SPACE, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. STARK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SIRE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. REYES, Mr. HIMES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana, Mr. WATT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SESTAK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. FALBOMAVEGA, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COSTA, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1409. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to establish an efficient system to enable employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to provide for mandatory injunctions for unfair labor practices during organizing efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. REICHERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 1410. A bill to provide assistance to improve the health of newborns, children, and mothers in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Primary and Public Health Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HINCHAY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1412. A bill to increase public confidence in the justice system and address any unwarranted racial and ethnic disparities in the criminal process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain public employees a deduction for distributions from governmental plans for health and long-term care insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. JONES, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 1414. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to end speculation on the current cost of multilingual services provided by the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GORDON of Tennessee:

H.R. 1415. A bill to provide for a demonstration project regarding Medicaid reimbursements for stabilization of emergency medical conditions by non-publicly owned or operated institutions for mental diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1416. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to expand the capability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide for the medical-care needs of veterans in southern New Jersey; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 1417. A bill to protect public health and safety, should the testing of nuclear weapons by the United States be resumed; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 1418. A bill to eliminate the exemption from State regulation for certain securities designated by national securities exchanges; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1419. A bill to sunset Federal laws and regulations which treat the American people like children by denying them the opportunity to make their own decision regarding control of their bank accounts and what type of information they wish to receive from their banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BARTLETT):

H.R. 1420. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a precious metals investment option in the Thrift Savings Fund; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 1421. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide Medicaid coverage of drugs prescribed for certain research study child participants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr.

HARPER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FORBES, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 1422. A bill to reauthorize through 2014 certain programs under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 1423. A bill to restore and make permanent the exclusion from gross income for amounts received under qualified group legal services plans and to increase the maximum amount of the exclusion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 1424. A bill to name the front circle drive in front of the Oscar G. Johnson Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility in Iron Mountain, Michigan, as "Sergeant First Class James D. Priestap Drive"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. SIREN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. McMAHON):

H.R. 1425. A bill to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. McKEON, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MICA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution expressing support for the District of Columbia school scholarship program; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H. Res. 228. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. BACA (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SABLON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 230. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H. Res. 231. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Deep Vein Thrombosis Awareness Month" and "National DVT Screening Day" and supporting efforts to educate the public about deep vein thrombosis, in memory of former Representative Jennifer Dunn; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H. Res. 232. A resolution recognizing and commending the Toys for Tots Literacy Program for its contributions in raising awareness of illiteracy, promoting children's literacy, and fighting poverty through the support of literacy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SKELTON):

H. Res. 233. A resolution recognizing the thousands of Freemasons in every State in the Nation and honoring them for their many contributions to the Nation throughout its history; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HARE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SHULER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. CARNAHAN):

H. Res. 234. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. SABLON.

H.R. 19: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 22: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DENT, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 24: Mr. DREIER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BONNER, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 52: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 98: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 111: Mr. LANCE, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 154: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 159: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 179: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 197: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 265: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 269: Mr. WU.

H.R. 272: Mr. MINNICK and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 303: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 333: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. TEAGUE.

H.R. 422: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 426: Mr. TONKO and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 444: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 503: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 510: Mr. MINNICK, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 574: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. DENT.

H.R. 578: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 606: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 610: Mr. BARROW and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 613: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FOXX, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MINNICK, and Mr. HODES.

H.R. 618: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 626: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 627: Mr. SCHAUER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. KRATOVIL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 664: Mr. GALLEGLY.  
 H.R. 669: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 847: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 848: Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 855: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 872: Mr. BOSWELL.  
 H.R. 873: Mr. DINGELL and Ms. HARMAN.  
 H.R. 875: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
 H.R. 877: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. PENCE.  
 H.R. 878: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 919: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 930: Mr. COOPER.  
 H.R. 939: Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 980: Ms. WATSON.  
 H.R. 983: Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 997: Mr. OLSON.  
 H.R. 1023: Mr. COLE, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 1054: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1058: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 1103: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
 H.R. 1135: Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 1147: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MASSA, and Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 1151: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1152: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1153: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1154: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1167: Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1190: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. SCHRADER.  
 H.R. 1204: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.  
 H.R. 1205: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HARE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1207: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PETRI, and Ms. FOX.  
 H.R. 1211: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H.R. 1240: Mr. COLE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVEGA, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
 H.R. 1242: Mr. TURNER.  
 H.R. 1245: Mr. ROONEY.  
 H.R. 1256: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HARE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HONDA, Ms. GIFFORDS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. MARSHALL.  
 H.R. 1264: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1276: Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 1285: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.  
 H.R. 1289: Mr. ELLSWORTH and Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 1293: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
 H.R. 1317: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H.R. 1319: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1326: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.  
 H.R. 1337: Mr. STARK.  
 H.J. Res. 18: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HODES, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. SHULER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H. Res. 81: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Res. 171: Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. OLVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H. Res. 174: Mr. LEVIN.  
 H. Res. 175: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. MARSHALL.  
 H. Res. 178: Mr. OLSON.  
 H. Res. 182: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. EHLERS.  
 H. Res. 209: Ms. TITUS.  
 H. Res. 211: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mr. NADLER of New York, and Mr. KENNEDY.  
 H. Res. 223: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MACK, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LEE of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. COLE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BONNER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. LAMBORN.